A PARAPHRASE ON S. Matthew's Gospel.

By the ever Memorable

Mr. JOHN HALES,

of *Eaton-Colledge*, &c.

Printed, 1677.

A

PARAPHRASE

ON

S. Matthew's Gospel.

By the ever Memorable

Mr. JOHN HALES,

of Eaton College, &c.

Printed, 1677.

A PARAPHRASE on St. Matthews Gospel.

CHAP. XII.

Scholar.

SIR,

Thank you for the pains you have taken in facilitating to my Understanding the scope and purpose of the XI. of St. *Matthew*: If I might not be too troublesome to you, I would also desire you to take the like pains with me in the Twelfth.

Maſter. I ſhall, with all my heart; provided that you will make your Objections, as they riſe within you; for peradventure, I may think you underſtand that which you do not, and not underſtand that which you do, and ſo loſe my Labour.

Scholar. I ſhall obey you readily, and therefore to begin with the beginning of the Chapter; I pray, Sir, how is it ſaid, 1. that, *At that time, Jeſus went through the Corn, with his Diſciples?* when in the very next Chapter before, it is ſaid, *That he ſent all his Diſciples away from him.*

Maſter. By theſe Words, *at that time*, is not meant the very next immediate Inſtant of time, to that, when he ſpake the laſt words going before; but ſuch a convenient

nient portion of time, wherein the twelve Diſciples might have gone about thoſe parts, whereunto they were ſent, and returned back again: So St. *Matthew*, having ſpoken newly of Chriſts dwelling in *Nazareth*, when he was a Child of about two years old, immediately ſubjoyns, *In thoſe days came John the Baptiſt*, as if *John* had come within ſome few days after his coming into *Nazareth*, when we know there paſſed eight and twenty years between.

Scholar. I believe it as you ſay, and therefore ſhall paſs to that which doth more trouble me, and that is, What that was, which the Diſciples did, *which was not lawful on the Sabbath day.*

Maſter. How come you to be troubled at that? Is it not ſaid in

plain Terms, *they plucked the Ears of Corn, & did eat them.* Why ſhould not you think that this was their fault?

Scholar. I ſhall tell you why: To my thinking, there are three things ſaid, 1. *That they went through the Corn.* 2. *That they plucked the Ears.* 3. *That they eat them.* Now whether all theſe or one of theſe was their Fault, I cannot tell; and I ſhall tell you the Reaſon of my doubt.

Firſt, It is true that their very Walking might have been their fault, becauſe it was not lawful on the Sabbath, to walk above the ſpace of two thouſand Cubits, and we know not how far Chriſt & the Diſciples might have come that day; But yet methinks, if that had been it, they ſhould have reproved Chriſt as well as his Diſciples, becauſe 'tis very likely they walk't the one

one as much & as far as the other.

Secondly, It is true, that their plucking the Ears of Corn might have been their fault, but yet methinks it should not, in regard the Law is so clear, in the 23. *Deut.* 25. *When thou comest into the standing Corn of thy Neighbour, then thou mayst pluck the Ears with thine hand, but thou shalt not move a Sickle unto thy Neighbours standing Corn.* And, truly why that, which is so plainly lawful at another time, should be unlawful on the Sabbath (being it is so far from being any kind of labour or servile work) I cannot imagine.

3. It's true, that they did eat them, and I cannot see what fault there is in that, unless you can shew me.

Mast. And peradventure I shall shew you more in that than you thought on. It is true that the general

neral conſent of Expoſitors runs on their plucking the Ears upon the Sabbath-Day, as being the thing condemned by the *Phariſees* for an unlawful thing: But I think they would be much troubled to prove it. The cuſtom and manner of the *Jews*, (eſpecially ſince the times of the *Macchabees*) being to allow Acts of greater labour and pain than the plucking of an Ear, namely, waging War againſt their Enemies, the Travelling of Carryers and Merchants, with ſuch others, even on the Sabbath-Day. I ſhould rather encline to think, that their Fault was Eating; eſpecially if that be true, which the very Heathen Poets tax and ſcoff them ſo with, namely, their *Sabbath-Faſts*. For if all things be well conſidered, I believe there will more be

be ſaid for this, than for the other Crime. And if a man will go no further than that Anſwer which our Saviour makes for them, he he ſhall find ground enough to be of this opinion. For, if the pretended fault had been working or labouring, our Saviour Chriſt might have eaſily laid his Anſwer upon *Joſhua*, or upon many others, who did greater work than this upon the Sabbath. But laying it as he doth upon *David*, and upon his Eating that which was forbidden: He ſeemes to Anſwer one unlawful Eating with another, when Neceſſity was a ſufficient diſpenſation for both. I do not oblige you to believe this as a poſitive Truth, but only tell you that as much may be ſaid for the one as the other; but if you wouldbe ſure to know what

their

their fault was, you had beſt put them both together and you will not miſs.

Scholar. I thank you for this Light, I wiſh you could give me as good in my next Objection.

Maſter. I ſhall do my beſt, what is that I pray?

Scholar. Our Saviour ſaith, in the third *Verſe* of this *Chap.* that *David did eat of the Shew-Bread, and they that were with him*; and the Holy Ghoſt ſaith, 1 *Sam.* 21. 1. where this Hiſtory is recorded, That there was no man with him, for it is ſaid there, that *Ahimelech the Prieſt was afraid at the meeting of David, and ſaid unto him, Why art Thou alone, and why is no man with Thee?* How ſhall I reconcile this Contradiction to my Thinking?

Maſter.

Master. The truth is, The Words of our Saviour in St. *Matthew*, are too plain and evident, than to admit of any other Construction, but that there were some other men with *David*; and if they could admit of it, yet St. *Mark* would put all out of doubt, for he saith expressly, that, *David did eat the Shew-Bread, and gave it to them that were with him*, *Mark.* 2. 26. And therefore, when the Priest saith, that there was no man with him in *Samuel*, it is best to understand that, of no man in sight, because, peradventure, *David* might have caused them to withdraw for the present, till he had got relief from the Priest, both for himself and them. And this, I conceive the best Satisfaction unto that doubt.

Scholar.

Scholar. I think it not improbable; but before I leave this ſtory of *David*, I pray, tell me how it comes to paſs, that our Saviour ſaith, *David entred into the Houſe of God*, in v. 4. of this Chap. when as yet the Houſe of God was not built, (*i. e.*) when as yet there was no Temple.

Maſter. It was well Objected, and the Anſwer to be given is this: That our Saviour calls that place where the Tabernacle then was, *The Houſe of God*, which afterwards became the proper appellation of the Temple.

Scholar. It is very likely: Now if you pleaſe, let us paſs from this Anſwer concerning *David*, to that concerning the Prieſts, in the 5*th.V.* where Chriſt ſaith, *That the Prieſts on the Sabbath-Day, prophane the Sabbath, and are blameleſs*: What doth he mean by that? *Maſter.*

Maſter. In thoſe words, our Saviour uſeth another Argument, in behalf of his Diſciples; which they call an Argument from the leſs to the greater, to juſtify their Plucking and their Eating on the Sabbath-Day. Amongſt the *Jews*, the Law of the Sabbath was ever ſo to be interpreted, as that it hindred not the Works of the Temple; and therefore it was a kind of Rule in the *Jewiſh* Law, that in the Temple there was no Sabbath. From this ſubmiſſion of the Law of the Sabbath to the works of the Temple; Our Saviour argueth to that, which is greater than it, The works of a Prophet, who was above a Prieſt: His Anſwer is in brief this; The Prieſts, by their works in the Temple upon the Sabbath, were not thought

to

to prophane the Sabbath; and therefore, there is leſs reaſon that my Diſciples, who are Prophets, ſhould be thought to prophane it, in doing of that which is a leſs work than theirs; And that this is the Scope of his Reply, will appear by that which follows, when he ſaith, *That in this place, there is One greater than the Temple*, in the *6th Verſe*; For, the truth is, every Prophet was greater than the Temple, that is, he was obliged in no caſe to the Laws & Cuſtoms of the Temple, but might ſacrifice out of it, when he pleaſed, as appears in the practice of *Eliah*. And whereas it may be Objected, That the Prieſtly Function, on the Sabbath, could not be performed without the Labour of Offering, but the Prophetical Function of the

the Diſciples might be performed on the Sabbath, without plucking ears and eating: The anſwer is, that both our Saviour and his Diſciples were ſo intent upon their Prophetical Employment, that, as elſewhere, *they forgat to take Bread*, So here, they either forgat, or had no time for the proviſion of victuals before the Sabbath, whereon to feed on the Sabbath.

Scholar. I apprehend your meaning, and deſire you to make the force of Chriſts third Argument as evident unto me, which follows in the ſeventh *Verſe*, where he ſaith, *But if ye had known what this meaneth; I will have mercy and not ſacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltleſs.*

Maſter. His meaning is no more but this, That when two Laws

ſeem to claſh ſo againſt one another, that both cannot be kept; the better is to be obſerved, and the worſe omitted; The Law which willeth us to *do good to all men*, and to further them in the means of their Salvation, which to a Chriſtian is a Law Moral, never to be omitted; is better than the Law which willeth us not to *work* or *eat* upon the *Sabbath*, which is onely a Law Ritual: Chriſt could not intend to teach, and the Diſciples intend to prepare and fit the minds of the people to be taught, and withall intend the preparing of ſuch things, as were requiſite to the ſtrict obſervation of the Sabbath; And therefore in Equity, the Law of the Sabbath ought to give place to the Law of Inſtructing the World in the

the ways of Happineſs, and not to have juſtled with it.

Schol. I conceive this Argument, but yet methinks, there follows ſomewhat like a Reaſon, which I do not yet conceive, in the next verſe; *For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath*; Pray ſhew me what the meaning is of that.

Maſter. They that by the [*Son of Man*] here, underſtand Chriſt, or the Meſſias, do miſtake; for in that acceptation of the Words, the Reaſon doth not hold: for if Chriſt had meant onely, that he as the Meſſias, was Lord of the Sabbath, and ſo could abrogate it at his pleaſure, then what needed all the three other Arguments, that went before? By the [*Son of Man*] therefore is to be underſtood every common ordinary

 man,

man, as appears moſt evidently by that of St. *Mark* 2. 27. *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath.* Beſides, at this time, Chriſt neither had preached, nor would have others to preach, that He was the *Meſſiah*; and a good while after this, as you may ſee in *Matth.* 16. 20. He charged, *that they ſhould tell it no man*, &c. The ſenſe therefore of the words, is this: That which is ordained for another thing, ought to give place to that thing, for which it is ordained: But the Sabbath was ordain'd for Man, every Man; therefore it ought to give place unto Him; namely, when a thing ſo nearly concerning Man, as his Salvation, ſteppeth in between. For, to be [*Lord of the Sabbath*] is, to diſpoſe and order the Sabbath unto his

his own use, and to have a Right so to order, and dispose it.

Scholar. I thank you for this pains: and because I have put you to so much already, I shall trouble you with nothing concerning the next Story of the man which had the withered hand, because I think I do well enough understand it; only, let me desire you to give me your opinion, why, when our Saviour Christ had healed him, and divers other men, of their diseases: It is added in the 16*th* verse of this Chapter, *And he charged them, that they should not make him known?*

Master. Truly, that which was the cause of his seceſs, or his withdrawing himself from them, in the Verse before may very well be conceived the cause also of this injoyn'd silence; namely, that He

might be ſafer from all violence, and force. But, they which ſay, that He did it out of charity to thoſe Phariſees who did ſeek his life, ſay not amiſs: as *Origen* reports of *Ariſtotle*, that he withdrew himſelf from *Athens*, not for his own ſake; but for the *Athenians* ſake, leſt he ſhould give them an occaſion of committing another murther, after the murther of *Socrates*. Hitherto, as yet, this Zeal and endeavours of the Phariſees to maintain the Traditions of their Elders, and the Religion of their Fathers, might ſeem ſomewhat excuſable; and therefore, Chriſt adding Miracle to Miracle, did wait for their repentance and amendment: in the mean time, preventing them by eſcapes, and concealing of himſelf, from doing him any violence or miſchief,

miſchief, till ſuch time, as that, reſiſting the Light and Teſtimony of their own Conſcience (as ſome of them did, very ſhortly after, as we ſhall ſee anon) they had more deſervedly drawn upon themſelves, the guilt of that innocent blood, which afterwards fell upon their heads: So, that when Chriſt, charged them that they ſhould not make Him known; He meant, only that they ſhould not diſcover where He was, that ſo with the more ſilence, and leſs oppoſition, He might do the buſineſs of his Father: and this ſenſe is agreeable to that which follows out of the Prophet *Iſaiah*, in the 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 *Verſes*.

Schol. I take it to be ſo indeed: but in theſe words out of *Iſaiah*, there is ſomewhat which does

much trouble me how to underſtand; and that is, the latter part of the 20. *verſe*; where it is ſaid, *Till he ſend forth Judgment unto Victory*: Pray, what do you take to be the meaning of thoſe words?

Maſt. I ſhall run through the whole words of the Prophet, and by that you will better underſtand that part. Theſe words of the Prophet *Iſaiah* are produced by St. *Matth.* for a confirmation of that Meekneſs, Humility, Quietneſs and Silence, with which the great buſineſs of our Salvation was to be diſpatched: For, by theſe words [*I will put my Spirit on Him*] is underſtood the Spirit of Meekneſs, Gentleneſs and Humility, which was emblem'd in the Dove, when it came upon him; and by thoſe words [*and he ſhall ſhew Judgment unto*

unto the Gentiles] is underſtood the preaching of the Chriſtian Law; and therefore, if you mark it in the 42 of *Iſaiah*, and the 4*th verſe*, it is added, as an explication of the word [*Judgment*] going before; *And the Iſles ſhall wait for his Law.* When He comes to preach this Law, or, to ſhew forth this Judgment, ſaith the Prophet, *He ſhall not ſtrive, nor cry*; that is, He ſhall diſcover no ſign of anger, or diſcompoſure in his mind; *neither ſhall any man hear his voice in the ſtreets*, ſaith the Prophet; that is, He ſhall cauſe no Tumult or popular Hubbub; He ſhall not expoſe the vices of Men to the knowledge and cenſure of the World, of whom He hath but the leaſt Hope that they will amend. *A bruiſed Reed ſhall he not break*, ſaith the Prophet; that

that is, the mind which is afflicted, He ſhall not afflict more: *and the ſmoaking flax ſhal he not quench*; that is, where he does but ſee a little *ſmoak*, He will look for ſome *fire*; He will ſo comply with the weakneſſes and infirmities of all Mankind, that he will not be out of hope to cheriſh them up into Virtues. And all this he will do, ſaith the Prophet, *Till he ſend out Judgment unto Victory*; of which words, whatſoever the ſenſe or meaning be, this is plain, that they contain the ſucceſs or event of that Meekneſs, Gentleneſs, and Quietneſs, which went before. Now, taking it for granted, that there is nothing left out in theſe words, as St. *Jerom* does ſuſpect, I can imagine but two ſenſes that can be put upon them: and thoſe two ſenſes ariſe out of the two ſeveral

veral acceptations of the word [*Judgment.*] For, *Firſt*, If by [*Judgment*] in this place, be meant the ſame, which was meant by [*Judgment*] in the 18*th verſe*, going before; then the ſenſe of the words is this; He ſhall preach the Chriſtian Law, with all Meekneſs and Mildneſs, maugre all oppoſition and malice of thoſe that do oppugn it, till that Law have prevailed, or gotten the victory; that is, till the greateſt part of all the World embrace it: and this ſenſe is no improper ſenſe, if we look no further. But then, *Secondly*, If by [*Judgment*] be meant, the diſceptation, or diſcuſſion of a Cauſe (in which ſenſe it is often taken in the Scriptures) then the meaning of the words is this; He ſhall uſe ſo much Meekneſs and Gentleneſs,

Gentleneſs, in working upon the minds of all Men in the World, that, let any Man ſit in Judgment upon that which he hath done, and he ſhall carry the Cauſe, or bear away the Victory. To this purpoſe ſaith the Pſalmiſt of God, that, *He is clear when he is judged*, Pſal. 51. 6. And in this ſence God ſaith of himſelf, *O ye men of Judah, judg ye, I pray you, between my Vineyard and Me*, Iſa. 5. 3. And in this Judgment Chriſt got the Victory, when with all Patience and Long-ſufferance, with all Gentleneſs and Meekneſs, He endured the perverſe and crooked diſpoſitions of the People of the *Jews*, and ſpared no Time or Labour to reform them, if they would have hearkned unto him.

Sch.

Sch. Sir, I confeſs there is much reaſon in what you ſay, but methinks it ſeems a little ſtrained ſenſe, to be put upon thoſe words, as you read them, *Till he ſhall ſend forth Judgment*; for according to your ſence, we ſhould read them thus, at leaſt, *Till he ſhall carry away the Judgment with Victory, or, to Victory.*

Maſt. You have judged very right, and ſo indeed ſhould we read them; For the word ἐκβάλλειν, which we render [*ſhall ſend forth*] is of the ſame ſignification with ἐκφέρειν, which doth ſignify [*to carry away.*] But you muſt bear with more faults in the Tranſlation of your Teſtament than this, and I hope you will bear with me, if I tell you plainly of them when I meet with them.

Sch.

Sch. I beſeech you do, for though I have a very great opinion of thoſe Men who did tranſlate the Teſtament; yet I would be loth to be a loſer by my reverence. But if you pleaſe, I will proceed in framing my Objections.

Maſt. You ſhall not need, for I foreſee whither you are driving, even towards the great Scruple that affrights the World, the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, of which there is mention in this Chapter, upon the occaſion of Chriſts healing of the blind and dumb man, poſſeſſed of the Devil, in the 22 Verſe of this Chapter.

Sch. I was indeed, and therefore if you pleaſe, let us come unto that Story.

Maſt. With all my heart; And firſt, I muſt let you know, that ſo ſoon

ſoon as the Phariſees ſaw that great Miracle which Chriſt had done; they ſaid, *that he caſteth out Devils by* Beelzebub, *the Prince of the Devils,* in the 24*th verſe* of this Chapter; and truly this was no unuſual practice amongſt the Sorcerers and Magicians, as is evident by many of the ancient Poets: when they could not prevail any other way, to uſe the help of the great and chiefeſt Devil (whoſe name they would threaten him to publiſh, if he did not help them) to expell, or caſt out other leſs Devils that poſſeſſed Men; In *Iamblichus* there is mention of that Form, in which they threatned him; and *Porphiry* ſays, that his name was *Serapis.* But, our Saviour ſufficiently refuteth that calumny, ſeveral ways. *Firſt,* By

a common and known Axiom amongſt themſelves, *Every Kingdom divided*, &c. and the meaning thereof is this; That the Devils are wiſe, there is no queſtion: but they that are wiſe, will rather ſeek to eſtabliſh Themſelves and their own Power, which is done by Concord and Agreement, than to diſtract and diſlocate it, which is done by Faction and Diviſion; therefore it is not likely that the Devils will ſo differ and diſagree, as the one to expell the other, as they would perſwade the World. *Secondly*, By Retortion, in theſe words, *If I by* Beelzebub *do caſt out Devils, by whom do your children caſt them out?* verſ. 27. And the force of Chriſts Argument is this: In a like Cauſe, Equity will that men give a like judgment; when your Diſciples

Diſciples do caſt out Devils, do not you think that they caſt them out by a divine Power? Therefore ſo ſhould you even think of me, if you thought aright: But I ſhould take this to be an *Ironie* rather.

Sch. I confeſs I did partly conceive the Scope of theſe two Arguments before, but that which follows, I do not underſtand, *But if I caſt out Devils by the Spirit of God, then is the Kingdom of God come unto you:* Pray make me underſtand it, that is, *Firſt*, What is meant by the [*Kingdom of God?*] *Secondly*, What is the meaning of this Conſequence, *If I by the Spirit of God caſt out Devils, then is the Kingdom of God come unto you*, For I ſee not how it follows.

Maſt. By the Kingdom of God

is meant the Time of the Meſſiah's being in the World, as in *Dan.* 4. 29. and *Dan.* 7. 14. And the Conſequence there inferred, is this, That as God, by ſundry Works and Miracles, gave his people of *Iſrael* a Sign of their inſtant Deliverance out of *Egypt*; So the great Miracles of Chriſt, were ordained by him, to be a Sign unto the World of a greater Deliverance, which was now working for them; and therefore where they ſaw the one, they ſhould expect the other.

Sch. I believe you have gueſſed right; But what ſay you to the Verſe which follows, *Or elſe how can one enter into a ſtrong mans houſe, and ſpoil his Goods*, &c. It looks like another Argument, which Chriſt uſeth in his own defence againſt this

this Calumny of the Phariſees, but I confeſs, I do not yet apprehend it.

Maſt. It is not unlikely, but anon you will. This is indeed a third Argument of Chriſts, and it toucheth to the quick; for whereas his other two ſerved onely to convince certain men, this comes to the very thing it ſelf, and quite overthrows it: There have been, ſaith Chriſt, who have caſt out Devils through *Beelzebub*: it may be ſo, but this hath been without any harm or loſs, from the one unto the other; it hath not come to ſpoiling of Goods, to extirpate out of the minds of men any of their ſins, but rather to encreaſe them: this hath been nothing but a meer colluſion and cheat: But when I caſt out Devils, you may

ſee I ſpoil them to the purpoſe, I rob them of their power; for, I plant in the minds of men ſuch Doctrine, as will admit of no vice and wickedneſs to be near it, (wherein the Power of the Devil does conſiſt) and therefore you may well imagine, that I am in good earneſt; for, I bind him and ſpoil him; which no one Devil ever yet did unto another, or ever will.

Schol. I ſhall deſire to put you to no more trouble in this *Verſe*: If you pleaſe, let us paſs unto the next.

Maſt. As I take it, that is this; *He that is not with me, is againſt me; and he that gathereth not with me, ſcattereth abroad.*

Schol. Truly, as the words ſtand alone, I ſhould not trouble you

you at all with them, for to my thinking, they are eaſie enough; but, as they follow upon what went before, I ſee not what our Saviour Chriſt might intend by them.

Maſt. Having declared himſelf to be ſo far from caſting out Devils in the name of *Beelzebub*, that He laboured to bind even *Beelzebub* himſelf, and to ſpoil him of all his power, which he exerciſed in the hearts of wicked men; He carries the conſideration of this Enmity between the Devil and Himſelf to ſuch a height, as that He will not admit of any Neutrality, in any other Man; profeſſing, that whoſoever is not the Devil's enemy, is his; according to that Axiom of the Wars, *Medii habentur pro Hoſtibus*: All indif-

ferent men are Enemies. And if all this be not enough to ſhew how far He was from operating by the help of Satan, ſurely, nothing can be. And therefore having ſaid this, conceiving he had ſaid as much as Man could ſay, He adds: *Wherefore I ſay unto you*, (verſ. 31.) that is, ſeeing it is evident by theſe Reaſons and Arguments, that all the Signs and Miracles which I do, I do by the Power of God, and not by the help of the Devil: Conſider what a wretched puniſhment you draw upon your ſelves, that thus do ſlander and bely me. This Connexion St. *Mark* does teach us plainly, Ch. 3. 30. where he ſays: Becauſe they ſaid, *He hath an unclean Spirit*. And yet it is to be conſidered, that our Saviour Chriſt proceeds

proceeds not meerly upon the ſtrength of his own Arguments; but as knowing their Thoughts, as St. *Matthew* tells us, in the 25*th verſe* of this Chapter, that is, He ſaw in unto them, and He knew that They verily believed, that the Miracle which he wrought, was wrought by the Power of God; but yet he ſaw, that they would rather invent any Lye, or aſperſe him with any ſlander (though they knew it well enough to be a Lye and ſlander) then to ſuffer the People to forſake their *Chair*, and to follow Chriſt.

Schol. I thank you, Sir, for this pains which you have taken, to prepare me for the underſtanding of my great Doubt, which now methinks, I begin to have a little

glimpſe of, but deſire you to give me better Light.

Maſt. I ſhall: But firſt, I would gladly know what you conceive of thoſe words, in the 31. *verſe*. *All manner of Sin and Blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven unto men*; becauſe, by underſtanding of what ſin ſhall be forgiven, you will the more eaſily underſtand me, when I tell you, what manner of ſin ſhall not.

Schol. Why Sir, I underſtand any manner of ſin whatſoever: and I underſtand the ſin of the Holy Ghoſt, to be the only ſin which ſhall never be forgiven.

Maſt. I did fear as much, and therefore I did ask you; But you muſt know that you are much miſtaken, both in the one and in the other opinion; For *Firſt*, It is to be conſidered, that Chriſt ſpeaks not

not of all ſin, but of that ſin, which is Blaſphemy or Calumny, (for there are many other ſins which will never be forgiven, as well as the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt,) And therefore in the next *Verſe* he ſaith, *Whoſoever ſpeaketh a word againſt the Son of Man*, that is, whoſoever ſlandereth or calumniateth any other man, *it ſhall be forgiven him*; And in thoſe words he expoundeth what he means by Sin and Blaſphemy. *Secondly*, It is to be conſidered, that when he ſaith, *All manner of Sin and Blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven*, there is an Hebraiſm in thoſe words, which is often met withall in Scripture; as in the 5 Chap. of St. *Matthew*, *Heaven and Earth ſhall paſs away, but my Words ſhall not paſs away*; that is, Heaven and Earth ſhall ſooner

paſs

paſs away, than my words ſhall paſs away; (and ſo St. *Luke* reads them) not that Heaven and Earth ſhall ever paſs away, but that, if it were poſſible, they ſhould ſooner paſs away than his Word ſhal. The meaning therefore of the words is onely this, All manner of Calumnies and Slanders, are heavy ſins, and ſhall hardly be forgiven to thoſe that do commit them; but they will be more eaſily forgiven, than that Calumny, which he knows to be a Calumny, who doth commit it: and this Chriſt calls Blaſpheming of the Holy Ghoſt; which was the Caſe of theſe Phariſees, who calumniated the Miracle which our Saviour wrought, as proceeding from the Devil, which their own Conſci-

ence

ence told them, iſſued from the Holy Spirit of God.

Sch. I confeſs, Sir, this is very plain and eaſie; and I pray, proceed to the 33. *verſe. Either make the Tree good, and his Fruit good,* &c. ſaith Chriſt: The dependance of thoſe words, is this: You ſay, I work by the Devil, ſaith Chriſt: But you do not ſee any other work of mine, beſides this Miracle, which looks like a work of the Devil: You ſee, I go about doing good; I exhort People to Repentance, I ſhew them the way to Heaven: Theſe are no works which the Devils uſe to do: Therefore, either ſay, that I do all this in the name of *Beelzebub* too; or elſe, acknowledge that I do my Miracles by the Power of God: for, Men judge of the Quality of the Mind,

Mind, by the common Actions, or Habits of their Life, as they do of Trees, by the Fruits which they produce, be they good or evil. And that this is true, ſaith Chriſt, you may judge by your own ſelves: For, *How can ye, being evil, ſpeak good things?* ſaith He, *ver.* 34. That is, you can never do it. A diſſembled and forc'd Mind will quickly ſhew it ſelf, ſome way or other, and will return unto its wonted habit; and therefore, as you may judge by your ſelves, that becauſe you ſpeak and do nothing but that which is evil, therefore, you your ſelves are evil: So you ſhould judge of Me, that becauſe you ſee, I ſay and do nothing but that which is Good, therefore I am good; and therefore

that

that Spirit which works in Me is good.

Schol. I apprehend all this; and therefore ſhall ſave you the labour of expounding that which follows, for I ſee, it all tends to the ſame end and ſcope; only, methinks I am much ſtreightned in my mind, about the 36*th verſe*, which forbids *all idle words*: for, if we muſt give account of every one ſuch, God be merciful unto me, and to many thouſand more; Pray, make me to underſtand the full latitude of this Commination of Chriſt.

Maſt. Whatſoever is meant by this *idle Word* here, you may be ſure it hath reference to that Word which the Phariſees had ſpoke of Chriſt, when they ſaid, *He caſt out Devils in the name of Beelzebub*, for Chriſt hath not done with this

Calumny

Calumny of theirs yet; but continues his diſcourſe upon it, till the 38. *Verſe* of this Chapter; Now conſidering this [*Idle Word*] in that reference, it is moſt reaſonable to expound it, not of every Word which a man ſpeaks, of which there is no profit, or which is good for nought, (for if that Expoſition ſhould be true, which God forbid, yet it were not pertinent,) but of ſuch a Word, wherein there is no Truth; For by *Idle*, and *Vain*, in holy Scripture, is often underſtood that which is falſe: And ſo to take the Name of God in Vain, in the Commandments, is to ſwear falſely: So that the Scope of Chriſt in thoſe Words is this, Do you think that you ſhall eſcape for this horrid Calumny which you have caſt upon me, know-

knowing it to be a Calumny in your own hearts? I tell you nay; for no man ſhall eſcape in the day of Judgment, for calumniating another man falſely, though he do not know that that Calumny is falſe; and therefore much leſs ſhall you. By which we may learn, if not to avoid all idle Words, (which to the nature and education of man is almoſt quite impoſſible,) yet to beware of calumniating perſons, not only when we know that Calumny is falſe, (which doubtleſs is a very grievous ſin) but when we are not evidently aſcertain'd that the thing is true. And therefore it is the ſpecial Office of a good Chriſtian, to refrain his Tongue altogether in that Point, for it is a rare thing for a man to give himſelf

ſelf the liberty, to repeat that of another which is falſe, and not to wiſh it true.

Sch. I thank you for this Satisfaction, and by Gods help ſhall endeavour to frame my Life and Converſation accordingly; for I perceive it is a Sin, which the World taketh little notice of; though indeed it be the deſtruction of Charity, without which no man is a Chriſtian: For ſo they avoid doing of that which is notoriouſly Evil, they care not what they ſay of any man. Now if you pleaſe, we will proceed to that which follows, I pray, what do the Scribes and Phariſees mean to deſire a Sign from Chriſt, in the 31*th* Verſe of this Chapter, who had ſeen ſo many before; for

for, methinks it ſeems a very impertinent Requeſt.

Maſt. Some Interpreters are of opinion that theſe Scribes and Phariſees were not the ſame, who ſaw thoſe late Miracles which our Saviour did; and they ground their opinion upon *Luke* 11. 16. where it is ſaid, *That others tempted him, ſeeking a Sign from Heaven*; But, upon examination, that opinion will not hold. The better anſwer is, that they did not deſire a bare ſign, or a Miracle, of which they had ſeen enough already; but they deſired a Sign from Heaven (as St. *Luke* ſpeaks) that is, that God by ſome ſtrange Prodigy there, ſhould declare him to be a Prophet ſent from him, if ſo be he were ſo indeed: For, as for thoſe Miracles which he did on Earth, they were

not ſatisfied with them, as apprehending them pendulous between two ſeveral Powers; for as they they might come from God, ſo they might come from the Devil; but, in Heaven they thought the Devil had no Power.

Schol. I like your reaſon well; but, I pray, what doth Chriſt mean by that anſwer which he gives to their requeſt in the 39, 40, 41, and 42 *verſes* for I do not underſtand it perfectly?

Maſt. The meaning of His Anſwer is this; You would have a Sign from Heaven, and then you will believe me: God, that will omit no occaſion to leave you unexcuſable, hath given you Signs enough, here upon Earth; but he is not bound to ſatisfie your humours, and give them where and when

when you would have them, he knows these which you have seen are sufficient to perswade Belief, if that your Avarice, and Profit, and Places which you hold in the present *Jewish* State, did not make you seek all Occasions and Cloaks for your Incredulity: And therefore, if those Signs which I have done on Earth, will not serve you; you shall have none from Heaven, but if you will, you shall have one from under the Earth, even the Sign of the Prophet *Jonas*, and that Sign not a Sign to convert you, who after so many Signs and Miracles will not be converted; but a Sign of my Innocence, and your Malice, which will persecute me even unto the death, for all that Good which I have done amongst you.

Sch. By this which you have ſaid, I do not only perceive the Scope and Purport of Chriſts Anſwer, which he gives them; but the Drift of *Verſe* 41 and 42 alſo, wherein he complains, That they who had had ſo many Signs done amongſt them, never would believe; whereas thoſe of *Nineveh*, and the *Queen* of the *South*, without any Sign or Miracle wrought, either by *Jonas*, or *Solomon*, believed all that was told them. But, I pray, how comes the next Diſcourſe in, concerning the unclean Spirit going out of a man, in the 43 *Verſe*? And what is the Scope and Purport of that Diſcourſe?

Maſt. It is not improbable, That our Saviour Chriſt, being much afflicted with the evil and incredulous hearts of the people

of

of the *Jews*, taketh a kind of Survey of that whole Nation, even from the time wherein they were first led away captive into *Babylon*, to the time when they were utterly destroyed by *Titus*. Before their Captivity, they were full of all manner of Wickedness, as appeareth by the Prophets; Under their Captivity, they were a little reclaimed, and upon that Amendment, were brought back again: But then after their Return, in the times not long before our Saviours coming, they fell into such Vices, as were abominable, even in the Heathens themselves, as is manifest in Story; and to shut up all, added thereunto the Contempt of their own Messiah, sent amongst them with so much power, and yet with

ſo much meekneſs, as man never came: Whereupon being juſtly forſaken of God, whom they had thus forſook, they became the moſt wretched and vicious people in the World, as *Joſephus* doth deſcribe them to be, about their latter times; And this Contemplation of their miſerable Condition, our Saviour ſeems to inſinuate, even unto themſelves, in this kind of Parable of the unclean Spirit going out of a man, and returning back again. Of which, If that which I have ſaid be not the Occaſion, (as I do not avow, but only offer it unto you) yet certainly this is the ſence, That thoſe men, who have once left and forſaken the vicious courſes of their carnal life, if they ever relapſe, and fall back again into them;

all

all their latter ſins are far more ſinful than their former; Almighty God juſtly revenging the Contempt of that Grace, which he hath offered to them, by giving them up to all manner of wickedneſs and uncleanneſs.

Sch. I think you have gueſſed right, and to the purpoſe; But there are ſome terms, and phraſes in this Parable or Story, or whatſoever you will call it, which I do not underſtand as, *Firſt* I pray what do you think Chriſt means *by walking through dry places, and ſeeking reſt, and finding none.*

Maſt. Dry and ſandy Grounds are no fit places of Habitation, and ſuch kind of places are all thoſe places where the Devil doth abide when he is out of man, who is only capable of Vice and Sin,

wherein the Devil taketh pleaſure: And the meaning of Chriſt is this, That as a man that travels, is wearied with heavy, ſandy, and dry way, more than with green, ſoft, and pleaſant Fields; ſo the Devil is not half ſo well ſatisfied, when he enters into any other Creature, as when he enters into Man.

Schol. It may be ſo indeed but then, why taketh he ſeven Spirits, more wicked than himſelf? why is the number of Seven here pitched on, more than any other?

Maſt. The Number of Seven is the Number of Perfection, or the ſignification of that which, in its own kind, is grown to full maturity, whether it be good or evil. So St. *John* calleth the Holy Spirit of God the *Seven Spirits*, Rev. 1. 4.

So

So the Barren is said to have *born Seven*, 1 Sam. 2.5. that is, to have been as fruitful as any other Woman is, or can be. And therefore when the unclean Spirit is said to take Seven other Spirits with him, the meaning only is, that that man becomes perfectly wicked, when that Spirit once returns again, whom before he had cast out.

Sch. I approve your Exposition of the Word, and think it likely. But I pray can you guess what business the Virgin, and the Brethren of Christ might have with him, because the Scripture saith *They staied without, to speak with him*, in the 47 Verse of this Chapter; peradventure you may think me curious, and therefore if Expositors have made no Con-

Conjecture thereupon, I will not urge you.

Maſt. Truly they have, and I ſhall not conceal it from you: They do imagine, that his Mother and his Kindred, having had ſome Inckling of the Phariſees conſpiring againſt him, to do him miſchief, deſired to ſpeak with him in private, and to contrive ſome way, to withdraw him out of danger: This will ſeem the more probable, if we conſider that which St. *Mark* ſaith, *Chap.* 3.21. *That his Friends would fain have laid hold on him, ſaying, that he was beſide himſelf*; which in all likelihood, they ſaid to make the Phariſees the leſs active in contriving any miſchief to him, as conceiving him a fitter Subject for their pity, than their hate; But it ſeems Chriſt

Chriſt would not hearken unto them, nay would not know them, as appears by the three laſt *Verſes* of this Chapter, which are ſo plain and eaſy, that I dare not ſuſpect your ſenſe, and apprehenſion of them.

FINIS.

Christ would not deceive us, so
that we may avoid the known dan-
ger appear by the three last Verses
of the Chapter, which are so
plain and easy, that I dare not
suppose ourselves, and application.
tion of them.

A

TRACT

Concerning the

Power of the KEYS

AND

Auricular Confession.

By the ever Memorable

Mr. *JOHN HALES*,

of *Eaton-Colledge*, &c.

Printed, 1677.

A

TRACT

Concerning the

Power of the KEYS

AND

Auricular Confession.

By the ever Memorable

Mr. JOHN HALES,

of Eaton-College, &c.

Printed, 1676.

A Tract concerning the Power of the KEYS, *and* AURICULAR CONFESSION.

IN opening the Point concerning the Doctrine of the *Keys* of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, I will follow thoſe Lines, that Tract, which your ſelf hath been pleaſed to ſet me. Yet firſt, ere I come to your particulars, I will diſcover, as far as generality will give me leave, what it is which we intend, when we uſe this phraſe of Speech. At the firſt appearance, it is plain, the form

form of words is not Proper, but Metaphorical. Now ſome Truth there is in that which you learnt in the Books of your Minority, from your *Ariſtotle*, πᾶν ἀσαφὲς τὸ κατὰ μεταφορὰν λεγόμενον; and indeed could we but once agree what it is which that Metaphor doth intimate, the greateſt part of the Diſpute were at an end. The natural way to diſcover this, is to ſee what the Uſe of *Keys*, properly taken, is; and after that, what means they are, which in our endeavours to attain to the *Kingdom of Heaven*, have ſomething proportionable to the Uſe of *Keys*: and this being once diſcovered, there can remain no Queſtion What are the *Keys*.

Now nothing is more known, than that the only Uſe of *Keys* is to Open and Shut, to admit us Unto,

or

or exclude us from the poſſeſſion of what we ſeek. Now ſince the *Kingdom of Heaven* is compared to a Houſe, from which all the Sons of *Adam*, by Nature are excluded; whatſoever then it is that gives us way, that removes all Obſtacles which hinder us from entrance of that Houſe, that certainly muſt be underſtood by the Name of *Keys*. Now all theſe means, or whatſoever elſe it is which doth further us towards the poſſeſſing our ſelves of Eternal Life, they were all laid down in the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, committed by him fully and firſt of all to the diſpenſation of the bleſſed Apoſtles, to be reported by them, or their means, all the World over. So that I think I may ſafely lay thus much for the firſt Ground of the Queſtion be-

Regnū Dei hic est Ecclesia (nō cœlū) in terris militans. vid: pag. 156.

twixt your ſelf and me, *Claves Regni Cœlorum ſunt Doctrina Evangelii.*

Now ſince Keyes are nothing without ſome hand to manage them, we muſt in the ſecond place diſcover into whoſe hands they are committed. And for this purpoſe, firſt of all, It muſt not be denyed that principally and properly, (I might well enough add only, if I liſted, but that I ſpare you) the Hand of God it is, that manages and applies theſe *Keys*; For of God and Chriſt it is written, *He hath the Keys, he opens, and no man ſhuts; he ſhuts, and no man opens.* Yet ſince it hath pleaſed God to uſe the Miniſtry of Men, to the ſaving of Men, and bringing them into the Kingdom of Heaven; In a ſecondary ſenſe the

the *Keys* of that Kingdom are ſaid to be put into the hands of Men. In as much as it hath pleaſed the Wiſdom of God, not to uſe theſe *Keys*, at leaſt as far as concerns the beneficial and opening part, ſome act of Man not firſt premiſed; for ſince that Faith in Jeſus Chriſt is the Sum of the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and Faith cometh not but by hearing, and hearing cometh not but by preaching, and preaching is the act of Men alone, (for God employs not Angels in that behalf,) It appears that this Preaching, or manifeſtation of the Doctrine of the Goſpel not performed, the *Keys* muſt needs be unprofitable. By the manifeſtation of the Goſpel of God, I mean not only the labour of the lip, in expounding, praying, reproving,

or the like, but the administration of Sacraments, the acting (if any thing beyond this is to be acted) whatsoever the manifestation of the Gospel requireth. So that I think I may set down for a second Ground towards the setling of the Point in question, thus much, That the managing or application of the *Keys*, so far forth as men are intrusted with them, is, *The Manifestation of the Doctrine of the Gospel.* Thus far have we opened in general the Substance of the *Keys*, and the Use of them. I come now to your *Queries*.

First, You ask of the quality of the Apostles receiving this Power, whether they had it as Judges *Authoritativè*, or as Messengers, *Declaratativè*, only to *propound*, or *denounce*? You manifest your self for

for the former, and Reaſons you bring, ſuch as they be. Your Reaſons I ſhall conſider in their place, but I muſt firſt tell you that you ask amiſs, for your queſtion is concerning the whole Power of the *Keys*, but you anſwer only of a part, that is, of Sacramental Abſolution only, as if all the Power of the *Keys* reſided there. So that here you uſe the Fallacy *pluri-um Interrogationum*; And I might well grant you, that indeed that part were *Judicativè*, but yet contend that all the reſt were only *Declarativè*. To reduce you therefore, I muſt do with you, as Phyſicians in ſome caſes deal with their Patients; ere I can come to purge the humour you are ſick of, I muſt a little prepare you. The power of the *Keys* is expreſt by

the Learned in three yokes, or pairs of Words.

1. *To remit, and to retain.*
2. *To looſe, and to bind.*
3. *To open, and to ſhut.*

On the one ſide, to *remit*, to *looſe*, to *open*, which is the one half of the power, agree in one, and ſignify the ſame thing; ſo do the other three, to *retain*, to *bind*, to *ſhut*, which contain the other half. To your Queſtion then, whether the power of the *Keys* be declarative only, I anſwer firſt: For this latter part or half, it is meerly declarative, neither can it be otherwiſe; which that you may ſee with your eyes, I muſt requeſt you to obſerve, That all ſhutting of the Kingdom of Heaven, is either common to all, or caſual, befalling only ſome. The common

Exclu-

Excluſion is that ſtate of Nature, wherein we all are involved, as we ſpring from the firſt *Adam*; The ſecond Excluſion is that which befals Chriſtians relapſing into ſin. The firſt ſhutting was at the fall, and was then Prefigured unto us, by the barring up of the way unto the Tree of Life. What active, what judiciary part can any Miniſter of the Goſpel have here? all that the Apoſtles could do here, was but to open to men this their miſery, a thing, before the death of our Saviour, either very ſparingly, or not at all revealed. Of this therefore you muſt needs quit your hands, and ſo you muſt of the other, I mean excluſion upon caſuality and relapſe. For when a man converted to Chriſtianity, falleth eſtſoons into

ſome mortal ſin, doth the Gate of Heaven ſtand open to him, till he fall upon ſome curſt Prieſt, that uſed his Key to ſhut it?

vid: pag. 149.

There are in the World a kind of deceitful Locks with ſliding Bolts, I have ſeen my ſelf and others much deceived by them, when the doors have fallen at our heels, and lockt us out when we intended no ſuch thing. *Sir*, Heaven door hath a ſliding Lock, upon occaſion of mortal ſin, it will ſhut without any uſe of a Key.

Perchance I do not well, παιζειν ἐν μὴ παιπτοῖς, yet the ſober meaning of what I have ſpoken merrily, is but this, that either you muſt make the Miniſtry of the Goſpel only Declarative, or elſe it will follow that every impenitent Relapſer, that hath the good fortune to eſcape

ſcape the Prieſts being privy to his Sin, is like to find Heaven open at the laſt. So then it is apparent, that notwithſtanding your heaping up of Interrogatories, and your preſſing of *Ligaveritis & vos*, and telling me what I never knew, that *Solvere* and *Ligare* be Actives; yet in this part of our Power, all your Activity is loſt, and there remains nothing for you but to report upon good evidence, what you find done by your betters to your hand.

Half your Juriſdiction then is fallen: and if I had no other *Medium* but this; I might with good probability conclude againſt you for the other part. For if the one half made in the ſame Form, in the like phraſe and garb of ſpeech, yet enforceth no more but Declaration

ration and Denouncing: then why ſhould you think the other half, (which in all likelyhood is homogeneal to the former) to be more? Nay, there is far more natural Equity that you ſhould be here only Declarative than in the other. Politicians tell us, That it is Wiſdom for Princes, who deſire to gain the love of their Subjects, to adminiſter themſelves all Favours and Graces, but to leave action of Juſtice and Harſhneſs to be performed by others.

Sir, No Prince can be ſo ambitious of the Love of his Subjects as God is of the Love of Mankind: why then ſhould I think him ſo ill a Politician, as to make himſelf the Adminiſtrator of the Rough, Unpleaſing, Love-killing Offices, of *Binding*, *Shutting*, *Retaining*;

ing; and then paſs over to the Prieſt, the diſpenſation of the Fair, Well-ſpoken, Ingratiating Offices of *Remitting*, *Looſing*, and *Opening*? But I will leave this kind of Topick and Dialectical arguing, becauſe you are a pretender to convincing Reaſons; I will directly enter even upon that part of your power of *Opening*, and *Remitting*, being the other part of your Territory, and by main ſtrength, take all activity from you there too. Give me leave to ask you one Queſtion, you may very well favour me ſo far, for you have asked me very many.

The Converſion of a Sinner, is it an act of the Keys, *yea or no*?

By your Principles it is not; for you make the power of the *Keys* to be judiciary, and therefore the

the Converſion of an Infidel pertains not to them: The Church of *Rome* will help you with a *Medium* to make this Argument good. *Do we not judge thoſe that are within? for thoſe that are without, God ſhall judge*, ſaith *Paul*: Whence ſhe infers, That a converted Infidel, not yet admitted to the Church, is a Stranger to the Judiciary Power of the *Keys*; but being once admitted into the Church, he is now become the Churches Subject, and ſo fit matter for the Prieſt to work on upon his next Relapſe. What think you of this Reaſon? Do you take it to be good? Take heed; or elſe it will give you a deadly ſtripe. For the Converſion of an Infidel, out of queſtion is a moſt proper act of the *Keys*. For, ſince the opening of the Kingdom of Heaven

ven is confeſt to belong unto the *Keys*; and Heaven, which was ſhut againſt the Infidel in time of his Infidelity, upon his Converſion is acknowledged to be opened unto him; certainly whoever converted him, uſed the *Keys*; or elſe he muſt pretend to have either a *Pick-lock*, or the Herb *Lunaria*, which, they ſay, makes Locks fall off from Doors, and the Fetters from Horſes heels. If then the Converſion of a Sinner be an act of the *Keys*, and by the Argument of the Church of *Rome* it be not judiciary, it follows then, that all Acts of the *Keys* are not Judiciary; and if not Judiciary, then Declarative only? For betwixt theſe two I know no mean.

But becauſe to diſpute againſt a man out of his own Principles, which

which perchance are falſe (for this we know oft falls out, that by the power of *Syllogiſms*, men may and do draw True Concluſions from Falſe Premiſes) becauſe, I ſay, thus to do, in the judgment of *Ariſtotle*, leaves a man (πεπεῖσ μεμὸν μεν ὠφελημένον ἢ ὄ, and I am willing not only to perſwade you, but to better you: I will draw the little which remains to be ſaid in this Point, from other Places.

Firſt, In all the Apoſtles practice in Converting *Jews* and *Gentils*, find you any thing like unto the act of any Judiciary Power? They neither did nor could uſe any ſuch thing. That they did not, appears by *Philip*, who having Catechiſed the *Eunuch*, and finding him deſirous of Baptiſm, immediately upon profeſſion of his Faith, admitted

mitted him into the Church. That they neither did nor could, appears by *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles in the *Acts*, who could never in the space of an afternoon, being none but themselves, have converted three thousand souls, had they taken any such way, as you seem to misfancy. Again, imagine with your self all circumstances you can, which are of force to make a power judiciary, apply them all to the practice of the Apostles, in the Conversion of Infidels, and if you find any one of them agree to that action, let me be challenged upon it, and be thought to have abused you with a Fallacy.

To conclude then, since your *Ligaveritis*, which is the one half of your pretended Jurisdiction, pretends

pretends to nothing above Declarative: And ſince your *Solveritis*, in ſo great an act as is the Converſion of Infidels, lays claim to no more, what act of the power of the *Keys* is it, wherein we may conceive hope of finding any thing active or judiciary? I ſee what you will ſay, There yet remains a part, you think, wherein you have hope to ſpeed, and that is the reconciling of relapſing Chriſtians: As you fancy that in every ſinning Chriſtian, there is a duty binding him to repair, and lay his ſin open to the Miniſter of the Goſpel, and in him a power to conſider of the ſins of ſuch as repair unto him, to weigh particulars, to conſider circumſtances, and occaſions, and according to true Judgment, either upon penance impoſed to abſolve ſin,

(which

(which you call remitting of the ſin) or to with-hold him for a time, from participation of holy duties with Catholick Chriſtians, which you call retaining of ſins, ſuppoſing that God doth the like in Heaven, as it is written, *What you bind in Earth, is bound in Heaven, and what you looſe in Earth, is looſed in Heaven.* Now the Rock on which you labour to found ſo extravagant a Conceit, is no other than the Words which I have quoted out of Scripture; you preſs earneſtly the *Ligaveritis & vos*, all which can yield you ſmall relief; for if they help you not at all in thoſe weighty parts of the Power of the *Keys*, which but now were laid before you; by what Analogy can you expect they ſhould afford you any aſſiſtance here? As

is *Ligare*, ſo is *Solvere*; as is the Converſion of an Infidel, ſo is the reconciling of a relapſing Chriſtian, for any thing you can make appear; Either all is *Declarative*, which is very poſſible, and in many caſes neceſſary, or all *Judicative*, which in ſome caſes is impoſſible, and in none neceſſary; ſo that to fit the Scripture to your Fancy, you are conſtrained to diſtract and rend it without any Warrant at all. But you have found out in the Text a ſtronger Argument againſt the declarative Power, I contend for: You eſpie an *Inſufflavit*, a great, a ſolemn, and unwonted Ceremony, undoubtedly concluding ſome greater matter than a poor power declarative: *What? did our ſerious Maſter thus ſpend his breath to no purpoſe, and*

like

like a Hocus Pocus *with ſo much ſhew act us a ſolemn nothing?* I pray who ſe words are theſe? I ſhould have thought them to have been *Porphiries*, or *Julians*, (but that I know your hand) for you ſubſcribed not your name to your letters: Ἀφίσατο ἀκέρδεια λέλογχε θάμινα κακαγόρως: They are the Words of your *Pindarus*, upon an occaſion not much unlike unto this

Sir, you have no Skill to judg, or ſet a price upon ſo divine an act; He loſt not his breath, when he ſpent his *Inſufflavit*; he opened their wits, that they might underſtand the Scripture; he revealed to them the Myſteries of Jeſus Chriſt, dying and riſing again for the Worlds ſalvation, the greateſt news that ever was reported in the World, and till then concealed;

He commanded them to be the firſt bringers of this good News, and that they might the more undauntedly perform their Charge, he endowed them with Infallibility, with infinite Conſtancy and Fortitude, with Power of working ſuch Wonders as none could do unleſs God were with them. *Appello Conſcientiam tuam*: Were thoſe things ſuch nothings, that they deſerve to be thus jeered? But that befalls you which befalls the Stares that dwell in the Steeple, who fear not the Bells, becauſe they hear them every day. Theſe wonderful Benefits of God have every day ſounded in your ears, and the frequency of them hath taught you to forget your Reverence to them. Yet all this *Inſufflavit*, this Ceremony, was for no other end but to fur-

further a *Declarative* Power; Their undaunted Fortitude, their power of Miracling, their Infallibility did but add countenance and ſtrength to their *Declarative* Power, by by which they went up and down the World, to manifeſt the good tydings of Salvation. So that even theſe which ſerved thus to ſet off the Goſpel, were nothing elſe but means of the better manifeſtation of it, therefore may they very well paſs, if not amongſt the *Keys*, yet amongſt the neceſſary Wards. Whereas your Fancy of an active or judicative Power in the Prieſt, concurring with God in reconciling relapſing Chriſtians, is neither one nor other, but is indeed like unto the work of ſome deceitful Smith, who the better to countenance and grace his work,

adds to his Key ſuperfluous and idle Wards, which in the opening of the Lock, are of no uſe at all.

To your ſecond Query, Whether the *Keys* were confined to the Apoſtles only? The Anſwer is in no caſe hard to give, it may perchance in ſome caſe be dangerous; for there is a Generation of men in the World (the Clergy they call them) who impropriate the *Keys* unto themſelves, and would be very angrie to underſtand, that others from themſelves ſhould claim a right unto them. To your Queſtion then, no doubt but originally none received the *Keys* from the mouth of our Saviour, but the Apoſtles only; none did nor ever could manage them with that authority and ſplendor

as

as the Apoſtles did, who were above all moſt amply furniſhed with all things fitting ſo great a work. For whereas you ſeem to intimate, that the preaching Miſſion was communicated to others, as the ſeventy two Diſciples, as well as the Apoſtles; you do but miſtake your ſelf, if you conceive that the *Keys* of the Goſpel were any way committed to them; for concerning the Myſteries of Jeſus Chriſt, and him crucified for the ſins of the World (wherein indeed the opening of the Kingdom of Heaven did conſiſt) they received it not, they knew it not. To be the prime Reporters of this, was an honour imparted only to the Apoſtles: Yet were they not ſo imparted, as that they ſhould be confined to them. E-

Every one that heard and received the Light of the ſaving Doctrine from them, ſo far forth as he had underſtanding in the waies of Life, had now the *Keys* of the Kingdom of Heaven committed to his power, both for his own and others uſe. Every one, of what ſtate or condition ſoever, that hath any occaſion offered him, to ſerve another in the ways of Life, Clergie, or Lay, male or female, whatever he be, hath theſe *Keys*, not only for himſelf, but for the benefit of others. For if natural Goodneſs teach every man, *Lumen de Lumine, Erranti comitèr monſtrare viam*, &c. Then how much more doth Chriſtian Goodneſs require of every one, to his ability to be a Light to thoſe who ſit in darkneſs, and direct their ſteps, who

who moſt dangerouſly miſtake their way? To ſave a ſoul, every man is a Prieſt. To whom I pray you, is that ſaid in *Leviticus*, *Thou ſhalt not ſee thy Brother ſin, but thou ſhalt reprove, and ſave thy Brother*? And if the Law binds a Man, when he ſaw his enemies Cattel to ſtray, to put them into their way; How much more doth it oblige him to do the like for the Man himſelf? See you not how the whole World conſpires with me in the ſame opinion? Doth not every Father teach his Son, every Maſter his Servant, every Man his Friend. How many of the Laitie in this age, and from time to time, in all ages have by writing for the publick good, propagated the Goſpel of Chriſt, as if ſome ſecret inſtinct of nature had

put

put into mens minds thus to do. I ſhame to dwell ſo long upon ſo plain a Theme, yet becauſe I feel your pulſe, and perceive what it is that troubles you, I muſt ſay ſomething to an Objection, which I know you make. You conceive that forthwith upon this which I have ſaid, muſt needs follow ſome great Confuſion of eſtates, and degrees, the Laitie will ſtraitway get up into our Pulpits, we ſhall loſe our credit, and the adoration which the ſimple ſort do yeild us is in danger to be loſt.

Sir, Fear you not, the ſufficient and able of the Clergy, will reap no diſcountenance, but honour by this: For he that knows how to do well himſelf, will moſt willingly approve what is well done by another. It is extream poverty of mind

mind to ground your Reputation upon another mans Ignorance, and to ſecure your ſelf, you do well, becauſe you perceive perchance, that none can judge how ill you do. Be not angry then to ſee others joyn with you in part of your Charge. *I would all the Lords People did Preach*, and that every Man did think himſelf bound to diſcharge a part of the Common Good: and make account that the Care of other mens Souls concerned him as well as of his own. When the Apoſtles took order to ordain ſome, upon whom the publick burden of Preaching the Goſpel ſhould lie, it was not their purpoſe to impropriate the thing to thoſe perſons alone; but knowing that what was left to the care of all, was commonly worſt

lookt

lookt unto, in wiſe and moſt Chriſtian Care, they deſigned ſome, whoſe duty it ſhould be to wait upon the Goſpel alone, the better to preſerve the Profeſſion to the Worlds end : It hath been the wiſdom of thoſe, who have taken care of the propagation of Arts, and Sciences, not only to appoint means, that multitudes ſhould ſtudy and make profeſſion privately, but that ſome ſhould be conſtituted publick Profeſſors to teach *è Cathedra*, that ſo all might know to whom to repair, in the doubts incident to their faculties, and this hath been thought a ſovereign way to preſerve Sciences. *Sir*, we are the publick Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, we ſpeak *è Cathedra*, which none can do, but ſuch as are ordained. Let the pri-

private profeſſion and practice of Chriſtianity improve it ſelf never ſo much, yet the honour of the publick Profeſſor, ſo he deſerve his place, can never impair. It greives me to ſtand ſo long upon ſo plain, ſo unwelcom a Leſſon, I will eaſe my ſelf and you, and reflect upon your third Query.

In the third place, you require to know, what neceſſity, or what convenience there is of Confeſſion: You mean, I think, that confeſſion, which is as fooliſhly as commonly called Sacramental, for it hath nothing of a Sacrament in it. Did I know your mind a little more in particular, what form of confeſſion you ſpeak of, whether as it is uſed in the Church of *Rome*, or in ſome refined Guiſe,

as

as it ſeems ſome would, who have of late called for it in the Church of *England*, I ſhould ſpeak peradventure more appoſitely to what you deſire. But ſince you have propoſed Confeſſion only in a generality, my anſwer ſhall be in like manner. And

Firſt of all, Confeſſion of ſins is a thing, not only convenient, but unavoidably neceſſary to Salvation, without which none ſhall ever ſee God. And thus far I ſuppoſe, all Chriſtians do agree. The main Difference is in the manner of practiſing it, the Queſtion being, What Parties are to be intereſſed in it? Natural Equity informeth us, that unto every Partie, juſtly offended, Satisfaction ſome way or other is due.

The

The first party wronged in every offence, is God, against whose Honour, and expres's Command every sin is committed. To him therefore in the first place, Satisfaction is due, by submission and acknowledgment, since there remains no other way of composition with God. But there are some sins committed against God, some committed against God and Men. In the former it is sufficient if we pacifie God alone; in the latter, our Neighbour, against whom we have trespast, must receive Satisfaction for the wrong done him, at least, if it be in the power of the Trespasser. Your Primer of *Sarum* will tell you, *That not to make restitution, if you be able, and not to pardon, unavoidably exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven.* Now might

might the Doctrine of Confeſſion and acknowledgment in caſe of Offence given, have been permitted to run fair and clear, as it deſcends from God, and good reaſon, the firſt Fountains of it. There needed no more to be ſaid in this argument, than I have already told you. But I know not what intempeſtive fooliſh Ambition hath troubled the ſtream, and it hath paſt now for a long time (till the Reformation altered it) for a general Doctrine in the Church, That in all kind of ſins, whether againſt God or our Neighbour, there can be no reconciliation betwixt the parties offending, and offended, but by interpoſition of a Preiſt, a thing utterly beſides all reaſon and common ſenſe, that you ſhould open your private

imper-

imperfections to one whom they concern not, (for it is granted, that all Parties concerned in an Offence, muſt have reaſon at the hands of the Offender) and who can no ways help you; For He that is conſcientious of his ſin, (and without trouble of Conſcience I think none would ever repair to his Confeſſor) knows very well, that there is no ſin ſo great, but upon ſubmiſſion, God both can and will pardon it; and none ſo ſmall, but pardon for it muſt be ſought, or elſe he hath been ill catechiſed. And more than this what can any Prieſt tell him: * Your *Pliny*, ſomewhere tells you, *That he that is ſtricken by a Scorpion, if he go immediately, and whiſper it into the ear of*

* *Plin. Nat. Hiſt. l.* 28. *c.* 10.

an Aſs, ſhall find himſelf immediately eaſed: That Sin is a Scorpion, and bites deadly, I have always believed, but that to cure the bite of it, it was a Sovereign Remedy to whiſper it into the Ear of an [ ] a Prieſt, I do as well believe as I do that of *Pliny*. The Patrons of this Fancy, for defect of reaſon and common congruity, are fain to betake themſelves to Scripture; and the miſcheif is, there is there no direct Text for it, and therefore they are conſtrained to help themſelves with a meer conjectural conſequence; For ſince it is taken for certain, that there is a Power to Remit and to Retain ſins, how ſhall they who have this Power given them, know how fit it is to Remit or to Retain a ſin, except they know the ſin, and know

know it they cannot, but by Confeſſion. For anſwer to this,

Firſt, We have found and proved, That the Words of Scripture muſt receive ſuch a ſenſe, as from whence no ſuch Conſequence can be inferred.

Secondly, We have indeavoured to prove, That the Diſpenſation or Application of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, (being nothing elſe, but the duty of ſaving of Souls) is a Duty, which *pro Occaſione oblatâ*, lies upon every Chriſtian: Which if it be true, (as in good faith I think it,) and the Clergy perceive it, I think they would never go about to urge that Text, although we ſhould yield it them in their own meaning. For they muſt needs ſee, that it follows, that you may as well

make your Muletter, (if you have one) your Confeſſor, as your Pariſh Prieſt. Tell me in good earneſt, if you can, out of what good intent can this deſire to know another mans ſin, which concerns you not, proceed? Is it to teach him that it is a ſin? he knew that, or elſe he had never repaired to you, to confeſs it: Is it to tell him, that he is to repent, to reſtore, to pray, to give alms, *&c.* All this he knew, or elſe he hath had his breeding under an evil Clergy. Yea, but how ſhall the Phyſician cure the Diſeaſe, if he know it not? Suppoſe all Diſeaſes had one Remedy, (as all ſpiritual Diſeaſes have) and what matters it if the Patient be ſick, to know whether it be an Ague, or the Meazels, or the Pleuriſie, ſince one Potion cures

cures them all? Yea, but if he know not the particulars, how ſhall he judg of the Quantity of the Doſes? for the ſame Diſeaſe upon ſundry circumſtances, may require *Majus* or *Minus* in the Phyſick. This is the pooreſt ſcruple of a thouſand; for in the Regiment of Patients ſpiritually ſick, there can be but one miſtake, that is, if you give too little: Be ſure you give enough, and teach your Patients to think no ſin to be little, (which in men ſpiritually ſick is *Error ſaluberrimus*) and you can never err: For natural Phyſick is only Phyſick; but ſpiritual Phyſick is both Phyſick and Diet, and may be indifferently adminiſtred both to the ſick and the ſound, Repentance perchance only excepted, of which upon occaſion, aſſure

your ſelf you can hardly take too much. What reaſon now can you give me, why you ſhould deſire to dive into any mans Breaſt, & *ſcire Secreta Domûs*? except it be that which followes in the next Verſe, *indè teneri*, as I muſt confeſs, I ſuſpect it is. The truth is, ſome miſtaken Cuſtoms of the ancient Church, the craft and power of the Clergy, the ſimplicity and ignorance of the Laity, theſe begat the *Tragelaphus*, of which we now ſpeak. It may be you take the practice of the ancient Church, and the Point of Excommunication, to make ſomewhat for you: When thoſe Cards ſhall come to be play'd (though that of Church cuſtom is not greatly material, which way ſoever it looks) I believe you will not find the

the Game you look for. Indeed I was once minded to have conſidered ſomething of that: But I think you look for a Letter, not for a Book, and I perceive my ſelf already to have gone beyond the compaſs of a Letter. Another parley therefore, if you pleaſe, ſhall put an end to thoſe and other ſcruples, if any do ariſe. And for the preſent give, I pray you, a little reſpite unto

From my Study,
this 8 *Day of*
March. 1637.

Yours,
J. H.

A

TRACT

Concerning

SCHISM

AND

SCHISMATICKS.

WHEREIN

Is briefly discovered the Original Causes of all *Schism.*

By the ever Memorable

Mr. *JOHN HALES,*

of *Eaton-Colledge*, &c.

Never before Printed by the Original Copy.

Printed, 1677.

A TRACT
Concerning
SCHISM.

Hereſie and *Schiſm* as they are in common uſe, are two Theological μορμὼ or *ſcar-crows*, which they, who uphold a party in Religion, uſe to fright away ſuch, as making inquiry into it, are ready to relinquiſh and oppoſe it, if it appear either erroneous or ſuſpicious. For as *Plutarch* reports of a Painter, who having unskilfully painted a Cock, chaſed away all Cocks and Hens, that ſo the imperfection

imperfection of his Art might not appear by comparison with Nature; so men willing for ends to admit of no fancy but their own, endeavour to hinder an inquiry into it by way of comparison of somewhat with it, peradventure truer, that so the deformity of their own might not appear. But howsoever in the common manage, *Heresie* and *Schism* are but ridiculous Terms, yet the things in themselves are of very considerable moment, the one offending against Truth, the other against Charity, and therefore both deadly, where they are not by imputation, but in deed.

It is then a matter of no small importance, truly to descry the nature of them, that so they may fear, who are guilty of them, and they

they on the contrary strengthen themselves, who through the iniquity of men and times, are injuriously charged with them.

Schism (for of *Heresie* we shall not now treat, except it be by accident, and that by occasion of a general mistake, spread throughout all the writings of the Ancients, in which their names are familiarly confounded) *Schism*, I say, upon the very sound of the word, imports Division; *Division* is not, but where *Communion* is, or ought to be. Now *Communion* is the strength and ground of all Society, whether *Sacred* or *Civil*; Whosoever therefore they be, that offend against this common Society and Friendliness of men, and cause separation and breach among them: If it be in civil occasions, are guilty

ty of Sedition or Rebellion; if it be by occaſion of *Eccleſiaſtical* difference they are guilty of *Schiſm*: So that *Schiſm* is an *Eccleſiaſtical Sedition*, as *Sedition* is a *Lay Schiſm*. Yet the great benefit of *Communion* notwithſtanding, in regard of divers diſtempers men are ſubject to, Diſſention and Diſunion are often neceſſary; For when either falſe or uncertain Concluſions are obtruded for Truth, and Acts either unlawful, or miniſtring juſt ſcruple, are required of us to be perform'd; in theſe caſes, Conſent were Conſpiracy, and open Conteſtation is not Faction or *Schiſm*, but due Chriſtian Animoſity.

For the further opening therefore of the nature of *Schiſm*, ſomething muſt be added by way of difference to diſtinguiſh it from neceſſary

neceſſary Separation, and that is, that the cauſes upon which Diviſion is attempted, proceed not from Paſſion, or Diſtemper, or from Ambition, or Avarice, or ſuch other Ends, as humane folly is apt to purſue; but from well weighed and neceſſary Reaſons, and that, when all other means having been tryed, nothing will ſerve to ſave us from guilt of Conſcience, but open Separation. So that *Schiſm*, if we would define it, is nothing elſe but an unneceſſary Separation of Chriſtians from that part of the viſible Church, of which they were once Members. Now as in Mutinies and Civil Diſſentions, there are two Attendants in ordinary belonging unto them; one the choice of one *Elector* or Guide in

place

place of the General, or ordinary Governor, to rule and guide; the other the appointing of some publick place or Rendezvous, where publick Meetings must be celebrated: So in Church-Dissentions and quarrels, two Appurtenances there are, which serve to make a *Schism* compleat;

First, The choice of a Bishop in opposition to the former, (a thing very frequent amongst the Ancients, and which many times was both the cause and effect of *Schism.*)

Secondly, The erecting of a new Church and Oratory, for the dividing Party to meet in publickly. For till this be done, the *Schism* is but yet in the Womb.

In that late famous Controversy in *Holland*, *De Predestinatione*, & *Auxi-*

Auxiliis, as long as the disagreeing Parties went no further than Disputes and Pen-combats, the *Schism* was all that while unhatched; but as soon as one party swept an old Cloyster and by a pretty Art suddenly made it a Church, by putting a new Pulpit in it, for the separating Party there to meet; now, what before was a Controversy, became a formal *Schism*. To know no more than this, if you take it to be true, had been enough to direct how you are to judge, and what to think of *Schism* and *Schismaticks*; yet because in the *Ancients*, (by whom many Men are more affrighted than hurt) much is said, and many fearful Dooms are pronounced in this case; will we descend a little to consider of *Schisms*, as it were by way of Story,

and that partly further to open that which we have ſaid in general, by inſtancing in particulars; and partly to diſabuſe thoſe who reverencing Antiquity more than needs, have ſuffered themſelves to be ſcared with imputation of *Schiſm*, above due meaſure; for what the Ancients ſpake by way of cenſure of *Schiſm* in general, is moſt true; for they ſaw (and it is no great matter to ſee ſo much) that unadviſedly, and upon fancy to break the knot of Union betwixt man and man (eſpecially amongſt Chriſtians, upon whom above all other kind of men, the tye of Love and Communion doth moſt eſpecially reſt) was a crime hardly pardonable, and that nothing Abſolves a man from the guilt of it, but true and unpretended

tended Conſcience; yet when they came to pronounce of *Schiſms* in particular (whether it were becauſe of their own intereſts, or that they ſaw not the Truth, or for what other cauſe God only doth know) their Judgments many times (to ſpeak moſt gently) are juſtly to be ſuſpected; Which that you may ſee, we will range all *Schiſm* into two ranks.

For there is a *Schiſm*, in which only one party is the *Schiſmatick*; for where cauſe of *Schiſm* is neceſſary, there not he that ſeparates, but he that occaſions the ſeparation is the *Schiſmatick*.

Secondly, There is a *Schiſm*, which both parts are the *Schiſmaticks*: For where the occaſion of ſeparation is unneceſſary, neither ſide can be excuſed from the guilt of *Schiſm*.

But you will ask, who ſhall be the Judg what is neceſſary? Indeed that is a Queſtion, which hath been often made, but I think ſcarcely ever truly anſwered; not becauſe it is a point of great depth or difficulty truly to aſſoil it, but becauſe the true ſolution carries fire in the tail of it. For it bringeth with it a peice of Doctrine which is ſeldom pleaſing to Superiors. To you for the preſent this ſhall ſuffice. If ſo be you be *Animo defœcato*, if you have cleared your ſelf from froath and grownds, if neither ſloth, nor fears, nor ambition, nor any tempting Spirits of that nature abuſe you, (for theſe and ſuch as theſe, are the true Impediments. why both that, and other Queſtions of the like danger are not truly anſwered) if all this be,

be, and yet you ſee not how to frame your reſolution, and ſettle your ſelf for that doubt; I will ſay no more of you than was ſaid of *Papias*, St. *John's* own Scholar, you are ἀνὴρ μικρὸς τὸν νῶν, your abilities are not ſo good as I preſumed.

But to go on with what I intended, and from which that interloping Queſtion diverted me; that you may the better judge of the nature of *Schiſms* by their occaſions; you ſhall find that all *Schiſms* have crept into the Church by one of theſe three ways; either upon matter of Fact, or matter of Opinion, or point of Ambition. For the firſt; I call that matter of Fact, when ſomething is required to be done by us, which either we know, or ſtrongly

ſuſpect to be unlawful; So the firſt notable *Schiſm*, of which we read in the Church, contained in it matter of Fact; For it being upon Error taken for neceſſary, that an *Eaſter* muſt be kept; and upon worſe than Error, if I may ſo ſpeak, (for it was no leſs than a point of *Judaiſm*, forced upon the Church,) upon worſe than Error, I ſay, thought further neceſſary, that the ground for the time of our keeping that Feaſt, muſt be the rule left by *Moſes* to the *Jews*; there aroſe a ſtout Queſtion, Whether we were to celebrate with the *Jews*, on the fourteenth Moon, or the *Sunday* following? This matter, though moſt unneceſſary, moſt vain, yet cauſed as great a Combuſtion, as ever was in the Church;

Church; the *West* separating and refusing Communion with the *East*, for many years together. In this fantastical Hurry, I cannot see but all the world were *Schismaticks*: neither can any thing excuse them from that imputation excepting only this, that we charitably suppose that all Parties out of Conscience did what they did. A thing which befel them through the ignorance of their Guides, (for I will not say their malice) and that through the just judgment of God, because through sloth and blind obedience Men examined not the things which they were taught, but like Beasts of Burthen patiently couched down, and indifferently underwent whatsoever their Superiours laid upon them. By the way, by this you may plain-

ly ſee the danger of our appeal unto Antiquity, for reſolution in controverted points of Faith, and how ſmall relief we are to expect from thence. For if the diſcretion of the chiefeſt Guides and Directors of the Church, did in a Point ſo trivial, ſo inconſiderable, ſo mainly fail them, as not to ſee the Truth in a Subject, wherein it is the greateſt Marvel how they could avoid the ſight of it; can we without imputation of extream groſneſs and folly, think ſo poor ſpirited perſons, competent Judges of the Queſtions now on foot betwixt the Churches? Pardon me; I know not what Temptation drew that Note from me.

The next *Schiſm*, which had in it matter of Fact, is that of the *Donatiſt*: who was perſwaded (at leaſt

leaſt ſo he pretended) that it was unlawful to converſe or communicate in holy Duties with Men ſtained with any notorious Sin. (For howſoever *Auſtin* and others do ſpecify only the *Thurificati & Traditores*, and *Libellatici*, and the like, as if he ſeparated only from thoſe, whom he found to be ſuch; yet by neceſſary proportion, he muſtrefer to all notorious Sinners) Upon this he taught, that in all places where good and bad were mixt together, there could be no Church, by reaſon of Pollution, evaporating as it were from Sinners, which blaſted righteous Perſons who converſed with them, and made all unclean. On this ground ſeparating himſelf from all whom he liſt to ſuſpect, he gave out that the Church was no

where

where to be found but in him and his Associates, as being the only Men among whom wicked Persons found no shelter; and by consequence, the only clean and unpolluted Company, and therefore the only Church. Against this Saint *Augustine* laid down this Conclusion, *Unitatem Ecclesiæ per totum Orbem dispersæ propter nonnullorum peccata non esse deserendam*; which is indeed the whole sum of that Fathers Disputation against the *Donatist*. Now in one part of this Controversie betwixt St. *Augustine* and the *Donatist*, there is one thing is very remarkable. The Truth was there where it was by meer chance, and might have been on either side, any Reasons brought by either party notwithstanding. For though it were *de facto* false, that

that *pars Donati*, shut up in *Africk*, was the only Orthodox Party, yet it might have been true, notwithstanding any thing Saint *Austine* brings to confute it; and on the contrary, though it were *de facto* true, that the part of Christians dispersed over the Earth were Orthodox; yet it might have been false notwithstanding any thing Saint *Austine* brings to confirm it. For where, or amongst whom, or amongst how many the Church shall be, or is, is a thing indifferent; it may be in any Number more or less, it may be in any Place Country, or Nation; it may be in All, and (for ought I know) it may be in none, without any prejudice to the definition of the Church, or the Truth of the Gospel. *North* or *South*, many or few,

dis-

disperſed in many places, or confined to one; None of theſe either prove or diſprove a Church.

Now this *Schiſm*, and likewiſe the former, to a wiſe Man that well underſtands the matter in Controverſie; may afford perchance matter of pity, to ſee Men ſo ſtrangly diſtracted upon fancy; but of doubt or trouble what to do, it can yield none. For though in this *Schiſm* the *Donatiſt* be the *Schiſmatick*, and in the former both parties be equally engaged in the *Schiſm*; yet you may ſafely upon your occaſions communicate with either, ſo be you flatter neither in their *Schiſm*: For why might it not be lawful to go to Church with the *Donatiſt*, or to celebrate *Eaſter* with the *Quartodeciman*, if occaſion ſo require? ſince

neither

neither Nature, nor Religion, nor Reason doth suggest any thing to the contrary: For in all publick Meetings pretending Holiness, so there be nothing done, but what true Devotion and Piety brook, why may not I be present in them, and use Communication with them? Nay what if those to whose care the execution of the publick Service is committed, do something either unseemly or suspicious, or peradventure unlawful? what if the Garments they wear be censured as, nay indeed be superstitious? what if the Gesture of adoration be used at the Altar, as now we have learned to speak? What if the *Homilist* or Preacher deliver any Doctrine, of the truth of which we are not well perswaded, (a thing which very often falls

falls out) yet for all this we may not ſeparate, except we be conſtrained perſonally to bear a part in them our ſelves. The Prieſts under *Eli* had ſo ill demeaned themſelves about the daily Sacrifice, that the Scriptures tell us, they made it to ſtink, yet the People refuſed not to come to the Tabernacle, nor to bring their Sacrifice to the Prieſt. For in theſe *Schiſms*, which concern Fact, nothing can be a juſt cauſe of refuſal of Communion, but only to require the execution of ſome unlawful or ſuſpected act; For not only in Reaſon, but in Religion too, that Maxim admits of no releaſe, *Cautiſſimi cujuſq; Præceptum quod dubitas, ne feceris.* Long it was ere the Church fell upon *Schiſm* upon this occaſion, though of late

it

it hath had very many; For until the ſecond Council of *Nice*, (in which conciliable Superſtition and Ignorance did conſpire) I ſay, untill that Rout did ſet up Image-worſhip, there was not any remarkable *Schiſm*, upon juſt occaſion of Fact; All the reſt of *Schiſms* of that kind were but Wantonneſs, this was truly ſerious. In this the *Schiſmatical* party was the Synod it ſelf, and ſuch as conſpired with it. For concerning the uſe of Images in *Sacris*, Firſt, it is acknowledged by all, That it is not a thing neceſſary; Secondly, It is by moſt ſuſpected; Thirdly, It is by many held utterly unlawful. Can then the enjoyning of the practice of ſuch a thing be ought elſe but abuſe? Or can the refuſal of Communion here, be thought any other thing

thing than duty? Here, or upon the like occaſion, to ſeparate, may peradventure bring perſonal trouble and danger, (againſt which it concerns every honeſt man to have *Pectus bene præparatum*) further harm it cannot do. So that in theſe caſes, you cannot be to ſeek what to think, or what you have to do.

Come we then to conſider a little of the ſecond ſort of *Schiſm*, ariſing upon occaſion of variety of opinion. It hath been the common diſeaſe of Chriſtians from the beginning, not to content themſelves with that meaſure of Faith, which God and Scriptures have expreſly afforded us; but out of a vain deſire to know more than is revealed, they have attempted to diſcuſs things, of which we can have no light, neither from Reaſon

Reaſon nor Revelation; neither have they reſted here, but upon pretence of Church-authority, which is none, or Tradition, which for the moſt part is but figment; they have peremptorily concluded, and confidently impoſed upon others, a neceſſity of entertaining Concluſions of that nature; and to ſtrengthen themſelves, have broken out into Diviſions and Factions, oppoſing man to man, Synod to Synod, till the peace of the Church vaniſhed, without all poſſibility of recall. Hence aroſe thoſe ancient and many ſeparations amongſt Chriſtians, occaſioned by *Arrianiſm*, *Eutychianiſm*, *Neſtorianiſm*, *Photinianiſm*, *Sabellianiſm*, and many more both ancient and in our time; all which indeed are but names of *Schiſm*;

howſoever in the common Language of the Fathers, they were called *Hereſies*. For *Hereſie* is an act of the Will, not of Reaſon; and is indeed a Lye, not a miſtake: Elſe how could that known ſpeech of *Auſtine* go for true, *Errare poſſum, Hæreticus eſſe nolo.* Indeed *Manichæiſm*, *Valentinianiſm*, *Marcioniſm*, *Mahometaniſm*, are truly and properly *Hereſies*; For we know that the Authors of them received them not, but minted them themſelves, and ſo knew that which they taught to be a Lye. But can any man avouch that *Arrius* and *Neſtorius*, and others that taught erroneouſly concerning the Trinity, or the Perſon of our Saviour, did maliciouſly invent what they taught, and not rather fall upon it by error and miſtake? Till that

that be done, and that upon good Evidence, we will think no worſe of all Parties than needs we muſt, and take theſe Rents in the Church to be at the worſt but *Schiſms* upon matter of Opinion. In which caſe what we are to do, is not a point of any great depth of underſtanding to diſcover, ſo be Diſtemper and Partiality do not intervene. I do not yet ſee, that *Opinionum Varietas, & Opinantium Unitas*, are Ἀσυσκεύα, or that Men of different opinions in Chriſtian Religion, may not hold communion in *Sacris*, and both go to one Church. Why may I not go, if occaſion require, to an *Arrian* Church, ſo there be no *Arrianiſm* expreſt in their Liturgy? And were Liturgies and publick Forms of Service ſo framed, as that they

admitted not of particular and private fancies, but contained only ſuch things, as in which all Chriſtians do agree, *Schiſms* on Opinion were utterly vaniſhed. For conſider of all the Liturgies that are or ever have been, and remove from them whatſoever is ſcandalous to any Party, and leave nothing but what all agree on, and the event ſhall be, that the publick Service and Honour of God ſhall no ways ſuffer: Whereas to load our publick Forms with the private Fancies upon which we differ, is the moſt ſovereign way to perpetuate *Schiſm* unto the Worlds end. Prayer, Confeſſion, Thankſgiving, Reading of Scriptures, Expoſition of Scripture, Adminiſtration of Sacraments in the plaineſt and ſimpleſt manner, were

were matter enough to furniſh out a ſufficient Liturgy, though nothing either of private Opinion, or of Church Pomp, of Garments, of preſcribed Geſtures, of Imagery, of Muſick, of matter concerning the Dead, of many ſuperfluities, which creep into the Churches under the name of Order and Decency, did interpoſe it ſelf. For to charge Churches and Liturgies with things unneceſſary, was the firſt beginning of all Superſtition, and when ſcruples of Conſcience began to be made or pretended, then Schiſms began to break in. If the ſpiritual Guides and Fathers of the Church would be a little ſparing of incumbring Churches with ſuperfluities, and not over-rigid either in reviving obſolete Cuſtoms, or impoſing new,

there were far leſs danger of *Schiſm* or *Superſtition*; and all the inconvenience were likely to enſue, would be but this, they ſhould in ſo doing, yeeld a little to the imbecillities of Inferiors, a thing which St. *Paul* would never have refuſed to do. Mean while, whereſoever falſe or ſuſpected Opinions are made a peice of the Church Liturgy, he that ſeparates is not the *Schiſmatick*; For it is alike unlawful to make profeſſion of known or ſuſpected falſhoods, as to put in practice unlawful or ſuſpect actions

The third thing I noted for matter of *Schiſm* was *Ambition*, I mean *Epiſcopal Ambition*, ſhewing it ſelf eſpecially in two heads; one concerning Plurality of *Biſhops* in the ſame See, another the Supe-

Superiority of Bishops in divers Sees. *Aristotle* tells us, that Necessity causeth but small faults, but Avarice and Ambition were the Mothers of great Crimes; *Episcopal Ambition* hath made this true: For no Occasion hath produced more frequent, more continuing, more sanguinary *Schisms*, than this hath done. The Sees of *Alexandria*, of *Constantinople*, of *Antioch*, and above all of *Rome*, do abundantly shew thus much, and our Ecclesiastical Stories witness no less, of which the greatest part consists in the factionating and tumultuating of great and potent *Bishops*. *Socrates* Apologizing for himself, that professing to write an Ecclesiastical Story, he did oft-times interlace the actions of secular Princes and other civil busi-

nesses tells us that he did thus to refresh his Reader, who otherwise were in danger to be cloyd by reading so much of the Acts of unquiet and unruly Bishops, ἐν οἷς καθ' ἁλλήλων ἐτύρευσαν, in which as a man might say, they made *Butter* and *Cheese* one of another; For τυρεύειν, (that I may shew you a cast out of my old Office, and open you a Mystery in Grammar) properly signifieth to make Butter and Cheese: Now because these are not made without much agitation of the Milk, hence τυρεύειν, by a borrowed and translated signification, signifies to do things with much agitation and tumult.

But that I may a little consider of the two heads, which I but now specified; The first I mentioned was the *Pluralitie of Bishops* in one Sea.

Sea. For the general practice of the Church from the beginning, at least since the original of Episcopacy, as now it is, was never to admit at once more than one Bishop in one Sea; And so far in this point have they been careful to preserve unity, that they would not suffer a Bishop in his Sea to have two Cathedral Churches; which thing lately brought us a Book out of *France*, *De Monogamia Episcoporum*, written by occasion of the Bishop of *Langres*, who, I know not upon what fancy, could not be content with one Cathedral Church in his Diocess, but would needs have two, which to the Author of that work seems to be a kind of spiritual Polygamy. It fell out amongst the Ancients very often; sometimes upon occasion

casion of difference in Opinion, sometimes because of difference amongst those who were interessed in the choice of Bishops, that two Bishops and sometimes more were set up, and all Parties striving to maintain their own Bishop, made themselves several Churches, several Congregations, each refusing to participate with others, and many times proceeding to mutual Excommunication. This is that which *Cyprian* calls *Erigere Altare contra Altare*: to this doth he impute the Original of all Church disorders; and if you read him, you would think he thought no other Church-Tumult to be a *Schism* but this. This perchance might plead some excuse; For though in regard of Religion it self, it matters not whether there

be

be one or more Bishops in the same Diocess, and sometimes two are known to have sat at once (for *Epiphanius* reckoning up the Bishops of *Rome*, makes *Peter* and *Paul* the first: and St. *Austin* acknowledgeth, that for a time he sat fellow Bishop with his Predecessor, though he excuseth it, that he did so by being ignorant that the contraty had been decreed by the Council of *Nice*,) yet it being a thing very convenient for the Peace of the Church to have it so; neither doth it any way savour of vice or misdemeanor; their Punishment sleeps not, who unnecessarily and wantonly go about to infringe it.

Hær. 27. §. 6. pag. 107. Edition

But that other Head of *Episcopal Ambition*, concerning *Supremacy of Bishops* in divers Sees, one claiming

ing

ing Superiority over another, as it hath been from time to time, a great Treſpaſſer againſt the Churches Peace, ſo it is now the finall Ruine of it. The *Eaſt* and the *Weſt*, through the fury of the two prime Biſhops, being irremediably ſeparated without all hope of Reconcilement. And beſides all this miſchief, it is founded in a vice contrary to all Chriſtian humility, without which no man ſhall ſee his Saviour; For they do but abuſe themſelves and others, that would perſwade us, that Biſhops, by Chriſt's Inſtitution, have any Superiority over other men, further than of Reverence; or that any Biſhop is Superiour to another, further than poſitive order agreed upon amongſt Chriſtians, hath preſcribed. For we have believed

lieved him that hath told us, *That in Jesus Christ there is neither high nor low; and that in giving honour, every man should be ready to prefer another before himself*; which sayings cut off all claim most certainly to Superiority, by title of Christianity; except men can think that these things were spoken only to poor and private Men. Nature and Religion agree in this, that neither of them hath a hand in this Heraldry of *secundum sub & supra*; all this comes from Composition and Agreement of men among themselves. Wherefore this abuse of Christianity, to make it Lacquey to Ambition, is a vice for which I have no extraordinary name of Ignominy, and an ordinary I will not give it, lest you should take so transcendent a vice to be but trivial. Now

Now concerning *Schiſm* ariſing upon theſe Heads, you cannot be for behaviour much to ſeek; for you may ſafely communicate with all Parties as Occaſion ſhall call you, and the *Schiſmaticks* here are all thoſe who are heads of the Faction, together with all thoſe who foment it: for private and indifferent Perſons, they may be Spectators of theſe contentions as ſecurely in regard of any peril of Conſcience (for of danger in Purſe or Perſon, I keep no account) as at a Cock fight. Where Serpents fight, who cares who hath the better? the beſt Wiſh is, that both may periſh in the fight.

Now for Conventicles, of the nature of which you deſire to be informed, thus much in general.

It

It evidently appears, that all Meetings upon unneceſſary Occaſions of Separation are to be ſo ſtiled, ſo that in this ſenſe, a Conventicle is nothing elſe but a Congregation of *Schiſmaticks*; Yet Time hath taken leave ſometimes to fix this Name upon good and honeſt Meetings, and that perchance not altogether without good reaſon; For with publick Religious Meetings thus it fares: Firſt, it hath been at all times confeſſed neceſſary, that God requires not only inward and private Devotion, when Men either in their hearts and Cloſets, or within their private walls, pray, praiſe, confeſs and acknowledge; but he further requires all thoſe things to be done in Publick, by troops and ſhoals of Men, and from hence have pro-

proceeded publick Temples, Altars, Forms of Service, appointed Times, and the like, which are required for open Assemblies; yet whilst men were truly pious, all Meetings of men for mutual help of Piety and Devotion, whereſoever and by whomſoever celebrated, were permitted without exception.

But when it was eſpied that ill affected perſons abus'd private Meetings, whether Religious or Civil, to evil ends, Religiouſneſs to groſs impiety, (as appears in the *Ethnick Eleuſinia*, and *Bacchanalia*; and Chriſtian Meetings under the Pagan Princes, when for fear they durſt not come together in open view, were charged with foul imputations, as by the report of Chriſtians themſelves plainly appears;

pears; and Civil Meetings many times under pretence of friendly and neighbourly Visits, sheltered treasonable Attempts against Princes and Common-weals:) Hence both Church and State joyned, and jointly gave order for Forms, Times, Places of Publick Concourse, whether for Religious or Civil Ends; and all other Meetings whatsoever, besides those of which both Time and Place were limited, they censured for Routs and Riots, and unlawful Assemblies in the State, and in the Church for Conventicles.

So that it is not lawful, no not for Prayer, for Hearing, for Conference, for any other Religious Office whatsoever, for people to assemble otherwise, than by Publick Order is allowed. Neither

may we complain of this in Times of Incorruption, for why should men desire to do that suspiciously in private, which warrantably may be performed in publick? But in Times of manifest Corruptions and Persecutions, wherein Religious Assembling is dangerous, private Meetings, howsoever besides publick Order, are not only lawful, but they are of Necessity and Duty; else how shall we excuse the Meetings of Christians for publick Service, in time of danger and persecutions, and of our selves in Queen *Maries* days? and how will those of the *Roman* Church amongst us, put off the imputation of Conventicling, who are known amongst us privately to assemble for Religious Exercise against all established order,

der, both in State and Church? For indeed all pious Aſſemblies in times of perſecution and corruptions howſoever practiſed, are indeed, or rather alone the lawful Congregations; and publick Aſſemblies, though according to form of Law, are indeed nothing elſe but Riots and Conventicles, if they be ſtained with Corruption, and Superſtition.

FINIS.

Miſcellanies

WRITTEN

By the ever Memorable

Mr. *JOHN HALES*,

of *Eaton-Colledge*, &c.

Printed, 1677.

Miſcellanies.

How to know the Church.

MArks and Notes to know the Church there are none, except we will make True Profeſſion, which is the Form and Eſſence of the Church to be a Mark. And as there are none, ſo is it not neceſſary there ſhould be. For to what purpoſe ſhould they ſerve? That I might go ſeek and find out ſome Company to mark. This is no

way neceſſary. For glorious Things are in the Scriptures ſpoken of the Church: not that I ſhould run up and down the World to find the perſons of the Profeſſors; but that I ſhould make my ſelf of it. This I do by taking upon me the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and ſubmitting my ſelf to the Rules of Belief, and Practice, delivered in the Goſpel, though beſides my ſelf, I knew no other Profeſſor in the World. If this were not the Authors end in propoſal of the Title, it is but a meer Vanity.

To the Deſcription of the Church.

The Church, as it imports a viſible Company in Earth, is nothing

nothing elſe but the Company of Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, whereſoever diſperſt in the Earth. To define it thus by Monarchy, under one viſible Head, is of novelty crept up, ſince men began to change the ſpiritual Kingdom of Chriſt to ſecular Pride and Tyranny, and a thing never heard of, either in the Scriptures, or in the Writings of the Ancients. Government, whether by one or many, or howſoever, if it be one of the Churches contingent Attributes, it is all; certainly it is no neceſſary Property, much leſs comes it into the Definition and Eſſence of it. I mean outward Government; for as for inward Government, by which Chriſt reigns in the Hearts of his Elect, and vindicates them from ſpiritual

Enemies,

Enemies, I have no occaſion to ſpeak, neither ſee I any reference to it in all your Authors Animadverſions.

How Chriſt is the Head of the Church.

From the Worlds beginning, till the laſt hour of it, the Church is eſſentially one and the ſame, howſoever perchance in Garment, and outward Ceremony, it admits of Difference. And as it was from the beginning of the World, ſo was it Chriſtian; there being no other difference betwixt the Fathers before Chriſt and us, but this, As we believe in Chriſt that *is Come*, ſo they believed in Chriſt that *was to Come*. *Jeſus Chriſt yeſterday, and to*

day

day, and the ſame for ever. Reference unto Chriſt is the very Eſſence of the Church, and there neither is, nor ever was any Church but Chriſt's; and therefore the Church amongſt the *Jews* was properly and truly *Chriſtian, quoad rem*, as we are. Now as this Church at all times is Chriſt's Body, ſo is Chriſt the Head of it. For it is as impoſſible for the Church, as for the Body to be without its Head; it is not therefore as your Author dreams. Chriſt came not to found a New Church, or to profeſs a Viſible Headſhip of it. That Relation to this Church, which we expreſs when we call him the Head of it, is one and the ſame, from the Beginning to all Eternity, neither receives it any alteration in this reſpect, becauſe the

Perſon

Perſon in whom this Relation is founded, is ſometimes Viſible, ſometimes not. 'Tis true indeed, the Head of the Church ſometimes became Viſible, but this is but contingent and by Concomitancy. For Chriſt the ſecond Perſon in the Trinity, becoming Man to Redeem this Church, and manifeſt the way of Truth unto it; It ſo fell out that the Head of the Church became Viſible. Of this Viſibility he left no Succeſſor, no Doctrine, no Uſe, as being a thing meerly accidental: I ask, Had the Church before Chriſt any Viſible Head? if it had, then was not Chriſt the firſt, as here our Teacher tells us; If it had none, why then ſhould the Church more require a Viſible Head, than it did from the Beginning. To ſpeak the

the Truth at once. All theſe Queſtions concerning the Notes, the Viſibility, the Government of the Church, if we look upon the Subſtance and Nature of the Church, they are meerly Idle and Impertinent : If upon the End, why Learned Men do handle them, it is nothing elſe but Faction.

Of Peter's *Miniſterial Headſhip of the Church.*

In your Authors Paragraphs concerning the viſible Encreaſe, or Succeſſion of the Church, there is no Difference betwixt us. As for the Proofs of *Peters* Miniſterial Headſhip, this firſt concerning his being the *Rock* of the Church,

that

that cannot prove it; For *Peter* was the *Rock* then, when our Saviour ſpake, but then could he not be the viſible Head, for Chriſt himſelf then was living, and by our Teachers Doctrine, ſupplied that room himſelf. *Peter* therefore, howſoever, or in what ſence ſoever he were the *Rock*, yet could he not be the viſible Head, except we will grant the Church to have had two viſible Heads at once.

Secondly, The Keys of Heaven committed to *Peter*, and Command to feed his Sheep, import no more, than that common Duty, laid upon all the Diſciples, *To teach all Nations*; for this Duty in ſeveral reſpects, is expreſt by ſeveral Metaphors. *Teaching*, as it ſignifies the opening of the

way

way to life, ſo is it called by the name of *Keys*; but as it ſignifies the Strengthning of the Soul of Man by the Word, which is the Souls ſpiritual Food, ſo is it called *Feeding*. Thus much is ſeen by the Defenders of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore they fly for refuge to a Circumſtance: It is obſerved, that our Saviour delivered this Doctrine to *Peter* alone (as indeed ſometimes he did) in this it is ſuppoſed that ſome great Myſtery reſts: For why ſhould our Saviour thus ſingle out *Peter*, and commend a common Duty to him, if there were not ſomething extraordinary in it, which concerned Him above the reſt? This they interpret a Preeminence that *Peter* had in his Buſineſs of Teaching, which they

they ſay is a Primacy and Headſhip; inforcing thus much, that all the reſt were to depend from Him, and from Him receive what they were to preach. For Anſwer, Grant me there were ſome great Myſtery in it, yet whence is it proved, that this is that Myſtery? For if our Saviour did not manifeſt it, then might there be a thouſand Cauſes, which Mans Conjecture may eaſily miſs: It is great boldneſs, out of Cauſes concealed, to pick ſo great Conſequences, and to found Matters of ſo great weight upon meer Conjectures.

Thirdly, The Prayer for Confirmation of *Peters* Faith, whence it came, the Courſe of the Story ſet down in the Text doth ſhew, It was our Saviours Previſion of

Peters

Peters danger to relapſe, which danger he had certainly run into, had not our Saviour extraordinarily prayed for confirmation of his Faith. And the Precept of confirming his Brethren, is but that charitable Office, which is exacted at every Chriſtians hand, that when himſelf had eſcaped ſo great a Wrack, to be careful in warning and reclaiming others, whom common frailty drives into the like Diſtreſs.

Theſe Circumſtances, that *Peter* is firſt named amongſt the Diſciples, that he made the firſt Sermon, and the like, are too weak Grounds to build the Soveraignty over the World upon; and that he ſpake *Ananias* and *Sapphira* dead, argues ſpiritual Power, but not temporal. But

that *Peter* called the firſt Council in the *Acts*, is a Circumſtance beyond the Text; for concerning the calling of the Council there is no word, all that is ſaid is but this, *that the Diſciples and Elders met*, no Syllable of *Peters* calling them together.

That *Peter* was 25 Years Biſhop of *Rome*, is not to be proved out of Antiquity, before St. *Hierom*, who ſhuffled it into *Euſebius* Chronicle, there being no ſuch thing extant in his Story. Yea that he was Biſhop at all (as now the name of Biſhop is taken) may be very queſtionable: For the Ancients that reckon up the Biſhops of *Rome* until their times, as *Euſebius*, and before him *Tertullian*, and before them both *Iræneus*, never account *Peter* as Biſhop

ſhop of that See: And *Epiphanius* tells us, that *Peter* and *Paul* were both Biſhops of *Rome* at once; by which it is plain he took the Title of Biſhop in another ſence than now it is uſed: For now, and ſo for a long time upward, two Biſhops can no more poſſeſs one See, than two Hedge-Sparrows dwell in one Buſh. St. *Peters* time was a little too early for Biſhops to riſe.

Anſwer to the Biſhop of Romes *Practice of Supremacy.*

To the firſt, That ſo many of the Biſhops of *Rome* were Martyrs, what makes that to the purpoſe? Is Martyrdom an Ar-

gument of the Supremacy ?

To the ſecond, That *Victor* indeavoured to excommunicate the *Aſiatick* Biſhops, is true; but withall it is as true, that he was withſtood for his Labour: For the Biſhops of *Aſia* themſelves did ſharply reprove him, πλημμελέστερον καθαπτόμενον, the Words of *Euſebius*; and *Irenæus* wrote againſt him for it.

To the third, That the firſt four Councils were called by the Popes, is an open Falſhood, for in the two firſt, the Biſhops of *Rome* are not ſo much as mentioned, ſave only as perſons cited. In the two laſt they are mentioned only as Petitioners to the Emperour. There are extant the Stories of *Euſebius*, *Socrates*, *Ruffinus*, *Theodoret*, *Sozomenus*, *the Acts of the Councils*

Councils themſelves, at leaſt ſome of them, *the Writings and Epiſtles of Leo Biſhop of Rome*. In all theſe there is not one word of the *Pope* farther than a Supplicant, and the whole calling of the Biſhops together is attributed to the Emperour. Take for Example but the laſt of them. *Leo*, Biſhop of *Rome*, was deſirous that ſome things done in a meeting of Divines at *Epheſus*, ſhould be diſannulled; for this he becomes a Suitor to *Theodoſius* the *junior*, to have a General Council, but could never procure it of him. After his death he continues his ſuit to *Marcianus*, Succeſſor to *Theodoſius*, who granted his requeſt; But whereas *Leo* had requeſted the Council might be held in *Italy*, the Emperor would not hear him; nay which is more, the Pope upon good reaſon, had beſought

ſought the Emperor to put off the day deſign'd for the holding of the Council, but the Emperor would not hear him. So that *Leo* could do nothing, neither for the calling the Council, nor for the Place, nor for the Time. And all this appears by *Leo's* own Epiſtles. If the Popes could do ſo little well near 500 years after Chriſt, how little could they do before, when their horns were not yet ſo long.

The Plea of the Proteſtants concerning the Corruption of the Church of *Rome*, which by them is confeſſed ſometimes to have been pure, is no more prejudicial to Chriſts Promiſe to his Church, *that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt her*, than the known corruption of the Churches in *Aſia* in St. *Johns* time, or of other Churches after.

The Cloſe of all is a Demonſtration.

tion. A Word unfortunately uſed by your Author, to bewray his Logick: For indeed a Reaſon drawn from ſo poor and empty a ſign, falls many bows wide of demonſtrative Proof. Firſt, it is falſe that all the reſt of Patriarchal Sees are extinct. The See of *Conſtantinople* yet ſtands, and ſhews her Succeſſion of Biſhops from St. *Andrew* till this day, as well as the Church of *Rome* can from St. *Peter*: The See of *Alexandria* yet ſubſiſts, and the Biſhop of that place calls him, Κρίτην τῆς οἰκουμένης, Judge of the World, (as my ſelf have ſeen in ſome of his Letters) a Title to which he hath as good Right, as the Biſhop of *Rome* hath to be the Worlds Sovereign. If any reply they are poor, in miſery, in perſecution and affliction: this can make no difference, ſince with Chriſt there is neither *rich* nor *poor*, but

but a new Creature. And again, their caſe now is as good as was the Biſhops of *Rome*, under the *Ethnick* Emperors; for their Lot then was no other than thoſe Biſhops is now. But grant that it had laſted longeſt, what then? ſome of them muſt needs have conſiſted longer than the other, except we would ſuppoſe that they ſhould have fallen all together. Peradventure the reaſon of her ſo long laſting is no other, but that which the *Cyclops* gives *Ulyſſes* in *Homer*, πύματον μὲν ἔτιν, Ulyſſes *ſhould be eaten laſt of all.* However it be, this Vaunt ſeems but like that of the wicked Servant in the Goſpel, *tardat Dominus venire*, and we doubt not but a day of the Lord ſhall overtake him who now eats and drinks, and revels with the World, and beats his fellow Servants.

FINIS.